

Survey Comments

Question 4

Have you or your neighbors had a project go through the permit review process with the County, Village, or Historic District?

Comments for Survey Response: You, Yes

- Kitchen addition, very reasonable process
- Myself-20+years ago were allowed some variances denied others. Neighbor, I did not object but did not agree with their decision on addition. Was never able to get copy of their plantings until trees planted on edge of their property that will grow over property line on to my property & near/into right of way for utility poles(power, phone/cable, etc.) where trees never existed in 30 yrs I've lived here.
- Historic preservation more consistent and easier to deal with than the Village.
- Bad. Very difficult to gain approval for simple process. In fact, at the hearing, there were people who did work without a permit; which was major; and same for approval AFTER the work had started. I came before and was denied.
- Addition of breakfast room to kitchen-rear of house (totally amicable)
- Rather slow (County) but professional.
- Our changes were small & were approved. For some neighbors it has been very cumbersome.
- Our personal experience was fair & expeditious.
- Straightforward, not difficult. Most of our experience has been with the county historic preservation commission and we handled that over the phone.
- Minor issues but no delays
- Very good
- We repaired our outdoor pool area. The process was a bureaucratic nightmare -- full of red tape. I note however, that Mr. Biddle was extremely helpful.
- Village staff were speedy & helpful
- OK
- 1980's Don't know, never consulted. Heather Cass was our architect. We asked for no variances. We had no problems. Our previous neighbors, Merle Thorpe, was obviously granted on exception to hide side lot restriction between 19 & 21.
- Very difficult. Overly restrictive.
- Loathsome, cumbersome, time-consuming, opaque, ill-logical, redundant, unpleasant, intimidating, arbitrary, anonymous, bureaucratic, haughty
- Went smoothly
- The process was reasonable, predictable and timely. However, our house is considered non contributing.
- OK.
- No problems, but we still resent it since were only bumping out a small segment 12" on the side of the house, unseen from the front!
- OK

- We had small projects & no problems.
- Routine.
- Good. No, problems. Year, timely, requests were reasonable. Did not hold us up.
- Handled by our architect & builder. Handled by our architect & builder. Uneventful.
- Historic Society rejected request to replace clapboard siding with vinyl siding. We were not pleased with their decision.
- No problems.
- It was fairly unencumbered
- Out experience with the county and Village went very well.
- Difficult -see saw between Village & County
- The Village review process is a star chamber conflicted by an entrenched clique. Lots of grudges, biases, & preconceptions lead to stultification & dissatisfaction in the Village.
- Straight forward but time consuming.
- trouble-free
- We were unable to make a pretty minor change because of the Historic District. Very frustrating. Specifically, we were unable to replace a contemporary wooden deck, not visible to street or neighbors, with a comparable deck made of a composite material because the historic board said they had never approved a composite and were reluctant to consider it.
- We needed a variance on some construction about 8 years ago.
- trees, fencing, permits, pool & tennis courts
- Tree removal, pop up
- 1--Routine re building, 2--Difficult re diseased tree on border of property shared with neighbor.
- No problem.
- Not pleasant. Historic District. To repair back of roof that could not be seen from street or by neighbors. Finally got permit not to replace in red slate but really an unnecessarily difficult process. No sense of important vs. unimportant.
- Village--19yrs ago Quite simple.
- With Village permission, we removed 2-3 big trees, and built a back fence.
- Added cupola to garage.
- Porch enclosure-Satisfactory Permit Process.
- Not a problem.
- Our experience, 15 years ago, was awful. The inspector was condescending and plainly hostile to us as new comers (or whatever). Even though the prior construction had impinged on the setback requirement by 4 feet, we were not allowed to impinge by 8 inches, requiring us to radically revise our plans. We have heard that more recent experiences have been quite different.
- Very, Very good. I really appreciated the personal attention given to me and my wife by Mr. Biddle and the Village Staff
- Our architect & builder handles everything. That said, we were concerned about delays due to discussion with other who had problems
- Efficient
- Very good input in a newer patio & steps

- Cumbersome, time consuming, too restrictive, political and does not value homeowners right of freedom on minor issues.
- Very unsatisfactory with denial by board. A waste of my money, effort and time, trying to be a good neighbor.
- Somewhat confusing (lots of rechecking code. Lots of individual permits)
- In 1993, we put in a 250 sq ft addition. Review process was minimal and went smoothly.
- Contractor did it. I don't remember any problems. Single building of an attached porch.
- OK
- It was a minor inconvenience
- Cumbersome
- No problems
- Arbitrary
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Complicated, costly, but in the end our plans were approved as modified.
- No problems with County or Village.
- good
- tree removal permit issued -satisfactory
- No undue complications
- We returned our back porch steps to the original (1909) position and re-did our back terrace. Experience: fine with CCV and HPC but time consuming with County.
- Great, No problems.
- County was easy. The Village was a little more difficult.
- Big hassle, esp. since we couldn't put a rail on our porch! But all in all a good thing. Even though we think we have good taste, others may not agree & procedural hurdles require people to be more thoughtful about projects.
- Generally positive.
- In 1998 at beginning of Historic District Status. Types of things objected to were absurd, so process was aggravating but not a significant impediment. Village permit review was easy.
- Good w/r/t small addition to house. Bad with tree removal. Decision was completely arbitrary.
- Partially-have completed historic review only. Testified at County Historic Preservation Commission about 1 Newlands Street construction - 2 different proposals. Participated in one hearing on our own 10 Newlands renovation.
- Ok-Our neighbor died, home was bought by a developer, who built a McMansion (very at of scale) we saw the plans but could make no legal objection.
- Ardous & Capricious Historic Preservation Commission.
- Generally satisfactory--the lack of clear guidelines frustrating; the one year permits can be too short to complete work; meeting board gets inconsistent seemingly random responses.
- Renovation of our house required County, Village and Historic Preservation permits. Process was straightforward but did add time, money and anxiety to project. Believe that if HAWP granted should pertain to all work including tree removal so as to obviate the need for add'l resources spent.

- No trouble with additions & improvement made to house. Applied for variance, experience did not result in a good outcome for us. Enforcement of regulations seemed arbitrary.
- It was handled by our contractor
- Building permit for 48-inch high gate on southwest side of property.
- Straight forward
- No Problems
- Not happy unnecessary any bureaucracy for a small project that would have essentially replaced an almost identical situation. An earlier smaller addition was done without a hitch.
- Architect went -No problem
- Good
- Recent experience for landscaping permit took longer than necessary due to mailing request to us rather than calling – bit frustrating. Suggest different form for landscape permits rather than building permit form - this should ensure applicant provides necessary documentation.
- Mine had been fine with the Village and to date, with the Historic District. Recently, my County experience has not been as good.
- No issues on our renovation. Several neighbors, however, have become embroiled in lengthy (over one year) and expensive battles on these issues because another neighbor has objected to their applications. This results is unconscionable. The standards need to be clear and set forth well in advance one neighbor should not have the power to delay by a substantial period of time. Another neighbor's project and on the process cause the expenditure of tens of thousands of dollars. Standards for permits should involve due process and less ambiguity.
- We have done major additions and had the contractor handle the permitting - when we do it ourselves it has been okay but have been denied permits - their approved.
- Don't remember any problems
- Excessive process (regarding exterior light replacement) had to take off a day from work to review non-existent county records. Set back issue. I replaced an existing light fixture. Excessive review of some minor issues, but you let major construction thru easily,
- speedy, easy
- With the help of our experienced contractor, the permit process was relatively easy to navigate through. The Historic process makes it more difficult with some of their changes to our plans which I did not always agree.
- Yes, with the Village - no problem. Shana is always very helpful.
- Routine and appropriate
- Granted permission to replace fallen cinder block wall with aluminum "wrought iron" look fence. Neighbor granted permission to replace crumbling asphalt driveway with pavers. Granted permission to tear down 4' cinder block wall between our driveway and neighbors.
- It was satisfactory
- We did not experience any difficulties
- "not particularly good" - decision seemed arbitrary, unnecessarily upsetting

- Was a small job. No difficulty. But we find that the permitting process for little things is getting petty, oblivious and control freaky. Merely replacing an existing, previously permitted fence, patio, or driveway now requires and roll with red tape and a fee.
- Unprofessional conduct & partisan secretive action by the Village Manager. HPC staff ineffective & lacking architectural qualifications sensibilities. LAP outspokenly biased in favor of development & lacking procedural safeguards.
- Historic review in Rockville was terrible they wanted to modernize the look of our house we fought back and prevailed but it was difficult.
- County & Village were fine; the HPC seemed poorly informed & arbitrary.
- Our experience with Mont. Co. HPC was positive but our experience with CCV approval was tense - concern over trees & potential underground water forced us to alter out plans. Neighbors' concerns were given priority over the science of what was possible.
- Our renovations occurred before the neighborhood became historic. The process was easy.
- Village & County very cooperative
- I have replaced portions of my existing backyard fence a few times. Very simple. No problems.
- County - Good; Village - Difficult
- Very efficient process
- Contractor handled
- Our contractor dealt with most of it. Fairly rigorous process.
- Through and Fair
- Handled by the contractor. Everything went very smoothly.
- We are currently dealing with the proposal from #11 East Melrose Street. The proposal would be better if 1. There were more guidance from and the Village 2. Respondents were given more time to address radical alterations such as that proposed for #11 (before HPC). Currently the HPC only gives 2 weeks from the filing of a historic area work permit. The Village should address this issue with HPC. It should also clarify the HPC's responsibilities in re preservation of trees.
- No problem
- Good
- It was difficult
- The historic preservation commission is very thorough in its review of new construction. Massing & size, compatibility with surroundings and streetscape, preservation issues, lot coverage, design features and tree removal are carefully considered.
- Our external renovations were before historic designation. Dealings w/the Village were fine. One neighbor has severe problems w/the HPC.
- Some problems & misunderstandings, but generally good.
- Historic tedious, confusing & somewhat arbitrary. Village--no problem.
- I had no problem with permit review process, improvements were modest. I have no knowledge of neighbor's experiences. Neighbor (former) across sheet made extensive changes and may have had problem.
- Don't have any knowledge re. neighbor's case.
- Easy & Informative

- The review process with the Historic District was legative. Applied for front 2nd story windows--they insisted on only wood-my house continues to settle due to a "spring" & only wood is going to continue to lose alignment. In spite of even the president asking us to increase energy efficiency, Hist. Group denied. They are a rude arrogant group.
Applied for a tree
- No problem with a permit to remove a dead tree.
- We added 3 feet to the back of our house & a bedroom over the old den. It was prior to the Historic design and I think it went smoothly.
- With the County Historic Preservation Commission, the process and criteria were clear and the commission staff followed them closely within the Village board, we were required to answer questions and justify design elements to satisfy the curiosity/whimsy of board members, regardless of whether they were not in the Village regulations.
- The Village staff was very helpful and acted quickly in approving our plans.
- Addition/remodel 13 years ago.
- Frustrating on Brookville when we put up a fence, an HPC staff person told me a chain link fence was historical yet HPC approved the addition behind us (Newland and Brookville) which doesn't belong in CCV. We did not oppose it because we thought HPC would require a design that was at least somewhat contextual. Had we seen the designs we would have opposed-our unstable.
- No Historic Dist. Stuff, -- Add +/- 53 years as a practicing architect + some development work + 38 years as full Prof in arch. @C.U.A.
- A neighbor planned a demolition and massive rebuilding without consulting neighbors. An underground driveway to basement garage was proposed and was approved by Village in absence of regulation of underground structures. This neighbor asked for variance before submitting the building permit.
- Our experience was very good- we painted our house, and received generous tax credits from the State & County, Many neighbors have done complete renovations and redesign and there the experience is more mixed. Result have been inconsistent. HPC & staff made an effort, but haven't always been as firm as they could or should be with major renovations, while sometimes too firm or inflexible with minor changes. While HPC is not perfect, nevertheless, its standards have given the Historic District much greater protection and preservation of the neighborhood, while allowing new homeowners to make extensive changes.
- In 1985 we did a kitchen addition requiring Village & County Permits, which were obtained by the architect & contractor. It went fairly smoothly as I recall.
- The historic review was easier than the Village review. Ours was pre-historic designation too. No neighbors complained which I am certain is key to things moving along.
- At my previous house on Primrose Street I went through the MC Permit review. Presently, I have an application pending at HPC.
- We did our renovation prior to historic designation. Our experience with the Village was fine until a neighbor protested after we had completed the outlines of the addition. They alleged that we were expanding into the setback. They were incorrect but caused us and the Village undue time and money. (We had offered to show them our plans prior to finalizing them and they did not want to see them.)
- With Village-experience fine-back in 1988

- My most negative experiences were with Chevy Chase Board members prior to 2000-- permit process has become easier
- since then--
- While there were a number of steps that had to be completed, the rules were clear and so it wasn't too painful.
- Good experience
- No problems.
- Extremely time consuming & burdensome. We had to consolidate 1 lot & parts of 2 others with a single lot before we could build a pool & garage--otherwise we would have built on a invisible lot line-a no. We had to jump through all the hoops that would have been required to build Levittown -it was ridiculous! Other projects have been easier but still a nuisance.
- Simple, fairly straight forward although time consuming. Expensive because contractors must basically be engaged in order to get details required for permits.

Comments for Survey Response: You, No

- No problems.
- Adjacent house-14 Grafton underwent large expansion.
- Next-door neighbors put large addition back of home & neighbors across the street restored façade and wrap around porch. We supported both plans
- Not sure.
- Neighbors got exception we were unhappy with.
- There has been construction everywhere on my street--next door & the next house & to the rear. Very noisy, very disruptive & loss of green space & trees. add patio; driveway replaced
- No experience personally, but hearsay, neighbor's application to extend back wall of house & back porch rejected on basis of exceeding maximum lot coverage limit.
- Porto-enough said
- It caused a delay--2wks or more.
- Neighbors added garage
- No significant issues (problems)
- Neighbor turned down by county in extending porch.
- I had to get a permit to remove a tree in my yard. My experience with the Village Office was very poor.
- A Conundrum between allowing & recognizing property rights & maintaining realistic & appropriate community standards
- No personal experience
- Our neighbors at 51 West Lenox Street sought approval at HPC for what were considered to be a "mansionization" plan. We opposed their application at the HPC over the course of 3 hearings spanning 2 1/2 years. Their plan finally won approval with minor modifications. The Hartmans decided to sell the property, which we have now purchased.
- Because X (ie me) lose light and privacy
- Don't have any knowledge re. neighbor's case.
- Done by builder: Went ok.
- The County appeals board was completely dysfunctional and didn't follow it's own rules.

- Disappointing experience with Historic District
- Don't know about neighbors
- Immediate- Neighbors on block have done many additions which look compatible with large living areas. Especially like the remodeling at 5404 Center Street.
- Inconsistent applications of the regulations. Definition of structure (assemblage of any materials too broad) leads Village to micro manage small issues.
- Useful to receive written notice. Neighbors also called or spoke with us in person
- My neighbors (3929, 3933) made modified, lovely additions
- Took way too long to get the permit for simply replacing a fence knocked down in a storm
- Good experience

Comments for Survey Response: Neighbor, Yes

- Kitchen addition, very reasonable process
- No problems.
- Myself-20+years ago were allowed some variances denied others. Neighbor, I did not object but did not agree with their decision on addition. Was never able to get copy of their plantings until trees planted on edge of their property that will grow over property line onto my property & near/into right of way for utility poles(power, phone/cable, etc.) where trees never existed in 30 yrs I've lived here.
- Historic preservation more consistent and easier to deal with than the Village.
- My wife and I did not have a good experience with the Village Board-although the manager and arborist agreed with our concerns over a very large oak tree. Very disappointed in the Board and their process.
- Addition of breakfast room to kitchen-rear of house (totally amicable)
- Rather slow (County) but professional.
- Our changes were small & were approved. For some neighbors it has been very cumbersome.
- Adjacent house-14 Grafton underwent large expansion.
- Our personal experience was fair & expeditious.
- Next-door neighbors put large addition back of home & neighbors across the street restored façade and wrap around porch. We supported both plans
- Straightforward, not difficult. Most of our experience has been with the county historic preservation commission and we handled that over the phone.
- Not sure.
- Very good
- We repaired our outdoor pool area. The process was a bureaucratic nightmare -- full of red tape. I note however, that Mr. Biddle was extremely helpful.
- Village staff were speedy & helpful
- Very difficult. Overly restrictive.
- Loathsome, cumbersome, time-consuming, opaque, ill-logical, redundant, unpleasant, intimidating, arbitrary, anonymous, bureaucratic, haughty
- Went smoothly
- Neighbors got exception we were unhappy with.

- OK.
- We had small projects & no problems.
- Routine.
- Good. No, problems. Year, timely, requests were reasonable. Did not hold us up.
- Fine. Quick.
- Handled by our architect & builder. Uneventful.
- Historic Society rejected request to replace clapboard siding with vinyl siding. We were not pleased with their decision.

Comments for Survey Response: Neighbors, No

- We needed a variance on some construction about 8 years ago.
- Architect went -No problem
- County - Good; Village – Difficult
- We are currently dealing with the proposal from #11 East Melrose Street. The proposal would be better if 1. There were more guidance from and the Village 2. Respondents were given more time to address radical alterations such as that proposed for #11 (before HPC). Currently the HPC only gives 2 weeks from the filing of a historic area work permit. The Village should address this issue with HPC. It should also clarify the HPC's responsibilities in re preservation of trees.
- Done by builder: Went ok.
- Immediate- Neighbors on block have done many additions which look compatible with large living areas. Especially like the remodeling at 5404 Center Street.

Question 5:

Please list any issues related to the physical characteristics of the community, e.g., house size, design, lot coverage, etc., that you believe should be addressed in this project:

Comments:

- The ratio of house square footage & height to lot size is very important to control.
- I think these issues should not be addressed on this level.
- For addition, height restrictions would not allow 3rd floor on my property 20+ years ago & can't believe new houses today don't seem to have that problem. Big issue I think is when new construction dwarfs existing neighbors & their "airspace". I personally would like to allow some type of overhang to protect from rain, etc. of doorways within the 7' property setback (assume this still in effect) storm water run-off very important.
- House size & lot size & all other regulations in the Village should follow the County.
- Anti mini mansionation and anti teardowns.
- Compatibility to neighbors houses, the street-in fact, the whole village, is essential.
- Houses should be in proportion to others in neighborhood. Houses shouldn't overwhelm neighbor's yard-view of sun & sky. Need to keep trees & grass proportional to lot.
- House size & % of lot covered.
- None- there are plenty of regulations on the book.

- Everything addressed in this survey is important. Is there any interest in regulating rear yard setbacks?
- Coverage height and setbacks; not design.
- McMansion should not be allowed. Nor should new construction with inferior building materials. Not to sound snobby but vinyl siding, fake stone and plastic fencing should be banned. Only brick, stone plaster and wood should be used. These material and smaller houses are better for the environment. New home builders should be forced to consider their carbon
- Design 2. No Discretionary (i.e. capricious) differentiation 3. Universal Standards (generous, up to the norms already approved or allowed)
- Restrictions should be adhered to on density & massive buildings...If density keeps increasing, and only should garages (2 sidewalks) be required but restriction must be lifted to permit/encourage off-street parking/garages to be built on existing same lot. With current Wisconsin Ave. development, we must accept that we need urban planning.
- None
- The most important objective is to avert the development of McMansions in the Village.
- house size/height, design, lot coverage, setbacks, vegetation requirements-groundcover-trees, mass & scale, storm water run-off maintain current standards
- Keep homes smaller
- Existing regulations are adequate. Lot coverage and setbacks should be flexible to encourage driveways and garages, particularly on narrower streets.
- House size lot coverage.
- 1-Rear yard setback without buildings such as garages. 2-Height of garages.
- House size particularly height. Lot coverage.
- Houses should be of similar scale as adjacent houses. Houses should not be permitted to exceed lot coverage (as currently exist in Village). No exception to 7ft side yard, establish a rear yard setback. Make it really hard to buy& tear down.
- House size. Appropriate design. Lot coverage.
- House size, Lot Coverage and Style/Design.
- Lot coverage, height, setbacks, tree requirements.
- Both house size and lot coverage.
- House size. Lot Coverage.
- Some ugly additions that don't match the old house or the community, like the house in the 100 section (north side) at Quincy, shouldn't be allowed.
- Size, Design and lot coverage.
- House size and lot size coverage both need to be limited.
- House size should be compatible with the neighborhood- as the design should also.
- House size & coverage
- House size & height, mass, lot coverage & setbacks. Preservation of trees, increase in paved surfaces esp. driveways
- Modern conception of house size & lot size. 2. Usefulness/lack of usefulness of large unused areas in an age of air conditioning & mosquitoes. 3. Ecological wastefulness of grass. 4. Tedium of imposed esthetic standards (even if informally imposed). 5. Misconception that this is a "community" held together by anything more than regulations.

- lot coverage, building height
- house size
- Emphasize compatibility with neighbors without restricting or legislating style
- OK with existing restrictions
- House size and lot coverage are important to avoid McMansions.
- House size, Design and Lot Coverage.
- Height; maximum lot coverage.
- House size & height. It seems to me there is some ambiguity in regulations, particularly in building height.
- Project should address issue of oversize house construction, with the goal of eliminating the danger that the Village could suffer the McMansion phenomenon.
- Height, Lot Coverage, Front, Side, Rear Setbacks, Design
- All of the above!
- House size, Lot Coverage.
- No "McMansions"
- Lot coverage is a major concern. Noise generation is also a problem (swimming pools and other backyard facility). Village should not be in the business of regulating esthetic matters, i.e. design.
- I firmly believe that a rear yard setback should be implemented. There is a project occurring at the house behind ours that has place a large addition on the back of the house. I am very surprise that there is not a rear yard setback. Our backyard is very important to us and the thought of structure two stories or higher being built or the property line is very important
- Front yard set back no exceptions. Should allow for exception in certain circumstances. Building forms more flexible or a -by lax base
- House relative size & height impact on neighbors
- house size; lot coverage
- I am concerned about unintended consequences including senselessly over zealous "enforcement" use of arbor regulation to steer business to keep deep pocketed providers is an example it had only increase cost to residents and raised questions about the propriety of administration lot coverage, materials used on exterior, window size, architecture style, tree preserved, color of home
- Architectural, contextual and sensitivity
- Maintain essential character of neighbor (home style, footprint, proportions)
- Certainly house size & lot coverage. Design should also be a consideration, to a lesser degree.
- House size - see new house- owner of Hesketh and Wisconsin. Better suited for Potomac - not Chevy Chase Village. What was approval process (see #7, 8 &9)
- preservation of tree canopy
- A newer home (last 10 years) home on Oliver Street seems too close to street (front yard setback) and driveway (circular in front of house) seems very out of place in the neighborhood.
- Mansionizing with cheap material such as wood - substitute siding, fake flagstone facing, etc.

- Size of house and size of lot (scale) our Grafton Street neighbor's addition is a good example of massive construction ~ side yard is our side yard - deck off Master Bedroom is intrusive
- House size within reason
- Other than basic continuity in the historic (and perhaps other) areas, the government (Village) should not be in the business of "taking" property from individuals through the type of intrusive regulation being considered here.
- Adequately addressed in following survey.
- Character the historic area should be preserved, but the landowner should reasonable freedom to build or add-on to his or her home.
- Should have maximum limit on size of newer or remodeled construction. Such as- Cannot exceed by more than x% of other homes within y feet of proposed building. There are some very large lots in Village. If lot coverage is only restriction, we could have real monstrosities.
- FAR of some recent construction or alterations has been out line with historical ratios in the Village. Building size dwarfs neighbor's homes.
- House size, height, lot coverage, FAR & design
- House Size, Lot Coverage, Design (to some degree)
- House size * should be compatible with other houses on the block. 2. Design should not be regulated variety is interesting.
- Lot coverage should preserve greenspace at front & rear * Mass and scale.
- House size, Lot coverage.
- Size of lot. 2. Height of new building. 3. Water run-off.
- All of the above.
- I'd like to see the 35% be reduced to low 30 & also additional mitigating design requirements.
- House design (not drastically & different) house size (not drastically different) lot coverage.
- Every effort should target preserving the character of our lovely community, including maintain maximum green space, trees, negotiation; resisting efforts to build or enlarge houses so that house sizes are restricted in footprint & height; continuing promote responsible services to everyone, such as providing water, power, trash removal and snow.
- My only concern is lot coverage and height.
- I am afraid that what is appropriate in scale of development will almost always be a subjective call. Generally, we need to keep sense of openness, light and mature large-scale trees in the Village, and not allow massing that works against this.
- All the above should be addressed. Architectural guidelines should be set.
- Encourage new homes & renovations to conform to rescale and feel of the neighborhood
- House size and design.
- House size, Lot coverage, design-difficult to legislate.
- House size vs. other homes in neighborhood & size of lot.
- House size in relation to lot size.
- Side yard setbacks 7', No appeal.
- Size, setbacks, maintenance

- rear yard setback, lot coverage
- Issue-maintaining character of Village - important. Dealing effectively with water run-off issues as related to renovation & new construction.
- Encourage larger houses provide lot size is adequate.
- All of the above, plus building height amount of imperious surface.
- house size
- Extremely large (relative to lot) new houses that dwarf their immediate neighbors should be looked at very carefully if not banned-meaning altered or changed to meet compatibility with neighbors
- Set backs - esp. rear yard set back; building height ie consistency with neighboring roof lines; noise/debris from project-I like existing guidelines; tree preservation/restoration if removal necessary
- Keep current Regs.
- All the above.
- Color- purple and other tell them tactile colors should not be permitted - Ban purple!!
- I think the continued use of common sense is the most important characteristic to be addressed.
- Design, for example, no more house like the new one being built on Montgomery Street
- There should be some consisting of size, design materials, coverage among homes on the same area of the Village, but it all has to be in context. If new regulations are enacted. There need to be resources that take context into account.
- Looks like you've covered it.
- Excessive lot coverage is currently allowed. FAR should be varied measurement of # of stories, roofline needs to be changes. 2 projects (demolition) & slant houses are in our area now.
- Heights, lot coverage & setbacks are very important and should be subject to tighten regulations
- Size, mass, lot coverage
- Concerned about tearing down houses & building McMansion
- We think there should be maximum building height & max lot coverage.
- None
- I share the concern with the huge new houses being built.
- I think its important that the character of the Village be preserved and that max lot coverage and set backs for homes be strictly enforced. I am also very concerned about the loss of mature trees with construction & home renovation going on everywhere. Easements & cut trees are being granted even though these must be replaced by sapling it is NOT the same.
- It is appropriate to limit scale and size of new construction
- Maintain & improve the sense of green and scale of this special green.
- 1. House size (lot coverage) 2. Rear yard setback 3. Side yard setback 4. Front of house orientation vis a vis street frontage 5. Height of building
- Style of Design, Size of house, Lot Coverage
- All the above
- House design in the West Village is largely uninspired. But the proportions with house size, lot and streetscape seem about right. Why mess with that?

- House Size 2. Lot Coverage
- I do not believe Chevy Chase Village has any problems to date that warrant additional building regulations. Existing code is sufficiently restrictive.
- All of the above; also procedural safeguards for interested parties; restrictions on managers ability to make decisions without notice & without referral to the Board
- Sidewalk on Brookville
- House size should be in good proportion to lot; design should be in keeping with traditions of neighborhood; lot coverage that seems appropriate
- "Modern & Contemporary" additions to historic houses are bad/ugly - addition should be in keeping with the original design of the house.
- Lot coverage.
- Footprint should not extend beyond existing front setback. No exception please to go closer to side boundaries more than privacy is at risk - we have a big drainage issues now with an addition on adjacent lot to us.
- Setback inside front & rear
- The character of Chevy Chase Village is one of a slower -age where homes were distinctive not cookie-cutter. Back yards were important. Our Village should not become a neighborhood of characterless mansions or modern boxes.
- Home design in historic district should remain under MC-HPC review. Construction & renovation in CCV should reflect the character of the existing structures in general size & materials. Below grade renovations should be encourage with the understanding that trees may be casualties- max out on below grade square footage.
- House size, house height, setbacks, lot coverage. I am less concerned about aesthetics and more concerned about, size, mass and lot coverage.
- Keep the "colonial" feeling. No "modern" or "way-out" homes such as spilt levels. Ramblers (small)
- Excessive massing of house relative to lot size.
- too big house on too small a lot
- Lot coverage should be limited so that yard & green space remain somewhat proportionate
- none.
- I don't have any issues with the houses. The additions/renovations I have observed look good.
- Design should comport in look of Historic Chevy Chase Village. 2. New Homes - Tear Downs - should be allowed as long as the design comports with historic street - scape look & house does not cover more than 35% of a lot-The mass and height of new houses.
- Since it sometimes appears that houses use more than 35% of the lot, clarification and verification of construction their meets their requirement should be made public for review.
- 1. Impact on neighbors light & loss of sky & green space should be addressed. This is de rigueur in jurisdictions across the US, but the Village, which prided itself in its preservation credentials, ignores this. 2. Mass & Volume are huge issues not just lot coverage. Mass & Volume have an impact on light, open spaces etc. If the Village, continues adding mass of the current role the Village will be a very different place in the next 20 years.

- I think the project should take a holistic approach to these issues, thus consider all- egg. House sizes, design, lot coverage.
- FAR, Lot Coverage
- Maintenance of the 35 % maximum lot coverage is important
- House size is an issue which should be reviewed. Tree preservation is also a significant issue.
- Compatibility of construction of new houses or additions with the neighborhood.
- Water drainage onto neighbors property, efficient furnaces that are blown on neighbors property, Size of house in relation to lot, parking.
- Physical characteristics included in the existing regulations were deemed to be important. The relative importance vary with location and individuals. I think height is crucial, but all were deemed important enough to be included in existing regulation.
- Any new construction should be characteristic of existing houses in the neighborhood.
- Pay more attention to bringing fiber into Village ASAP.
- House size.
- Compatibility & other houses -e.g. the mansions at the end of the street overlooking the Giant parking lot are a monstrosity. Lot coverage should not be changed.
- House design should be consistent with the architecture of neighborhood. i.e. a) no very modern designs b) roofs classical not Spanish style c) no fences in front of houses and certainly not painted white.
- I strongly feel that new houses should blend into the existing neighborhood. Several on Primrose north do not, the additions to the corner of Newlands * Brookville on the south corner is an eye sore! I have seen houses overpower the lots & ruin the neighborhoods!
- Size/Mass, Design compatibility, placement of garage doors
- Drainage-repeatedly changes are made that adversely impact water run off and drainage. Sump pump locations, etc. Need to be central to one review process.
- The new houses in Village take up too much of the area space of their lot.
- All houses in the block should be about the same height.
- House size, lot coverage, compatible designs, occupancy/traffic impact
- Building surface materials are not addressed in this survey.e.g. large, sandstone colored stones are incongruous to this area.
- All of the above regulations should be reviewed with an eye toward tightening-- especially building height and maximum lot coverage.
- We feel that FAR should be used-(in the case of a large lot-there should not be maximum allowed coverage).
- Would like some rules to prevent too much of lot being covered. Strongly oppose any rule that treats people/houses differently depending on what happens to exist next to them.
- house size, lot coverage, mass & scale compatibility
- Lot coverage and structure size, design-but not if there were an effect we HPC-all things equal, we would prefer CCV design review. Would not regulate landscape other than significant trees.
- The only control that should be added is "Bulk"-Everything else works--Design Control has been ruled unconstitutional.

- Add more lighting to footpaths
- We think that new or rebuilt houses in the Village should conform in size, footprint, and design with the surrounding houses in the neighborhood. We object to the "mansionization" of so many recent building projects.
- House on Hesketh Street is an example of what should not be allowed for house size; the way the lot is covered, both percentage of coverage and if buildings fill one side such as new house built on Montgomery Street.
- Far is probably the most important issue.
- The purpose of this project is to look at the entire community so that we don't lose our community's character - the park like setting and old style charm - house by house until a street look like a new subdivision - see other areas of Chevy Chase. Therefore, house size (footprint and height) and imperviousness must be addressed ASAP.
- Lot coverage, Tree - Replacements should be large specimens, Bulk of house, height of auxiliary buildings - one level only, location of auxiliary on lot
- Lot Coverage, house size, height placement of auxiliary building (garages, tools sheds etc.), replacement trees should be larger specimens
- I think the words mass and scale need to be defined better more quantitatively. The terms are vague and allow for too much interpretation by an individual, this and very suggestive terms. What's mass and scale to one person is not the same to
- I think in America property is almost sacrosanct and I think that great caution should be exercised when contemplating a taking no matter how small or aesthetically desirable.
- Everything should be addressed including design. We live in a charming, architecturally consistent community with very few examples of extreme mansionization, such as Hesketh (at Wisconsin). Let's keep it that way.
- Everything
- The issues that most concern us are storm water drainage and trees. We are concerned about drainage both in terms of basement flooding and the nature of what drains ultimately into the Bay. Thus we would hope to reduce impervious surfaces and ensure that more of the Village would be covered with absorbent plantings (e.g. the rain garden behind the Village hall). More deciduous trees in front and behind houses would not only improve the aesthetics, but more importantly, help absorb runoff and reduce our energy consumption, particularly in the summer.
- Building Height, Building Mass, Lot Coverage
- Lot coverage for small lots, house size
- House size-mansionization
- None
- Building Height to roofline, bulk of house, shadows on neighboring property, setbacks, visibility from front, runoff.
- House size should be in proportion to lot size. The green spaces, trees and gardens on private property are essential to the overall quality of the Village.
- Side yard setback should be increased from 7 Ft. current regulation.
- Swimming pool installation
- Storm water drainage management. Basement area below ground flooding should not be evacuated to neighbor's property.

- New underground garage should have required flood management plan before being permitted. Village should have a rear yard setback
- Our biggest concern is preserving green space & ruining the neighbors view. We favor setbacks on all sides-better to go up than out.
- Chevy Chase Village should not be involved in regulating local development
- A uniform minimum front yard setback which everyone builds to result in an unfortunate boringness on the street appearance.
- Respect, observe, and commit to HPC guidelines as they currently exist. Continue to allow improvements & changes in homes to fit 21st century family requirements.
- House size and lot coverage don't want "mcmansions."

Question 6:

What do you think the Village government's role should be in further regulating building mass and scale and other physical characteristics of the community?

Comments for Survey Response: None

- We have enough regulations in the Village and the County. Add to that the historic preservation aspect and we have all the controls needed. If the Board wishes to add some "voluntary" guidelines, that may be acceptable.
- Many Village lots are underdeveloped. The Village should encourage redevelopment to enhance the tax base and quality of housing.
- I'm opposed to any and all new regulations and to some already in existence. It is not enough that we have to cope with Federal, State and County regulations? Considering the value of Chevy Chase Village property and the real estate taxes, people should be able to improve their property with as few restrictions as may be necessary. From what I've seen over past 75 yrs. everyone seems to do what they want unless their name is Klein!! No further comment necessary except "GIVE US A BREAK".
- Am not in favor of further complicating the building codes. Its currently over-restrictive and intrusive.
- With Montgomery County & Historical Society, I don't think the Village needs to take on this role. Voluntary design guidelines would be ok.
- None in the historic area. The historic preservation commission already conducts a very thorough review
- Follows current zoning for Montgomery County as they are adequate.
- HPC is very involved with the historic sites. The other Village properties can't need another level of oversight.
- Village should do NOTHING! The HPC guidelines are thorough and thoughtful. HPC staff do an excellent job of reviewing projects and helping citizens revise projects to meet guidelines. The Village cannot afford to duplicate the staff or effectiveness of HPC process.

Comments for Survey Response: Refine Existing Standards

- Be Consistent! Horrible governance. So disappointed in your process.
- It seems both prudent and necessary to control the tendency to construct mansions anywhere. In some parts of the Village, the older homes are mansions, and they fit, look great--there, but not everywhere.
- We believe that adding regulations is an important step to control development. It makes no sense for the Village not to take advantage of this opportunity. If we can create new regulations. Let's put some teeth into them. Need to add rear yard setback regulation
- The Village should adopt additional regulations and standards related to the mass and scale of buildings in the Village.
- Voluntary standards should not be adopted- They will be ignored. If the Village is going to do something about the problem it should be binding.
- Possibly the Village could take over role of county, as its requirements include the County's while adding other rules by allowing residents a one-stop shopping experience the process might well be more humans accessible. Going to redundant Board is time consuming at best...In this way the process might be shown to be a helpful one which benefits the Village, its residents & their property values. ~ possibly add voluntary design guidelines as to style of vegetation.
- Design "guidelines" merely allow people to disguise the actual scale & mass of buildings. They are a last resort, or should be-besides, if voluntary they are effectively meaningless.
- Voluntary design guidelines would be useless & no action is intolerable in the light of the changing environment. Clearly, some change some change is needed. How long has it been since the setbacks for example were set at 7'/25'?
- The Village should have the same regs as MoCo outside of the Historic District.
- Please keep size in proportion to existing houses & value green space & trees.
- Preserving the character of the Village can only be done by careful restrictions.
- The concept to preserve the historical look of Chevy Chase is well intended. The problem is lifestyles & standard have changed in the past 100 years as well as the quality of building materials. The process does not adequately recognize this or the spirit of a neighborhood. ie. Swing Sets.
- Should have maximum limit on size of newer or remodeled construction. Such as- Cannot exceed by more than x%of other homes within y feet of proposed building. There are some very large lots in Village. If lot coverage is only restriction, we could have real monstrosities.
- New construction and/or alterations should be compatible with neighbor's structures.
- In general, additional regulatory restrictions should be limited to assuring safety & restricting adverse physical effects on neighboring property.
- A way must be found to protect the Villages' essential character without being too rigid and stifling the ability of property owner to manage their property - the key is balance
- Voluntary guidelines will not deter a few who will build to the max in all directions and destroy the streetscape. The tree canopy will be lost, esp. in rear yards.
- We should not get involved in design.
- If the Village adopts rigid standards today, reflecting the will of a vocal group and it's style preferences, it is inevitable that changes later in design, construction and living

styles will make those standards obsolete and way too restrictive. Some modest changes may be appropriate, but not comprehensive strict standards.

- None. Only concern is "McMansion" problem and this is adequately addressed by height and lot coverage restrictions with refinements e.g., limit total volume of structures above 1 story. Allow 35% lot coverage, but only 20% lot coverage above 12 feet, or something like that.
- Voluntary is not likely to work. Developing side yards and dramatically redeveloping existing houses is often done at hands of folks who don't have sense of (how what they are doing affects) Village ambience. We can't pull up the gangplank or freeze the Village in time, but we need rules to prevent really inappropriate things from happening.
- Preserve character of existing neighborhood homes.
- Village regulations should reflect & reinforce the historical patterns of this historic district.
- Same as above. I would hope that compliance would happen without a lot of new Village laws and the bureaucracy that would follow however; I realize that this could be difficult.
- Set back; tree preservation/replanting
- Everyone wants to do what he/she want but wants everyone else to conform to rules. But, I think in the end, most everyone is glad for rules which protect the integrity of our beautiful neighborhood. Just look around!!
- Design, for new construction should be compatible with existing houses! See house on Montgomery Street use an example of what not to approve!
- Do not make standards so tight that it discourages sale of homes or ability of owners to upgrade.
- I don't think voluntary guidelines will reach the people who should be reached.
- There should be standards on distance between properties & height allowances
- Do not leave plan up to the Village Manager. I'm not happy with house at end of Hesketh near Wisconsin Ave. or the one on Montgomery just being finished.
- By definition, "voluntary" is an invitation to disregard. Set standards or don't
- The Village gov. should not try to be Architects but we need to stop the "modern addition". Expansion or addition in the some theme are fine. Example 16 Newlands looks like a jailhouse and should never have been allowed.
- Do not give CCV board too much of a role in design approval process. They are not professionals in that field (HPC staff are & can put personal opinion aside) and CCV board has very subjective ideas on these issues. Perhaps a dedicated staff members with a degree in architecture could take on this role in working w/ residents & their architects & builders. CCV should proceed under the assumption that, in general, CCV residents want to create lovely homes & landscapes.
- Keep the present "character" of the Village Mansions - oversized not in keeping with Village should not be permitted.
- Guidelines and process should be consistent from Village to County to State (MD Historic Trust)
- Be practiced where necessary ie, driveway access width, existing shade trees "dying" that are a detriment to you and your neighbors
- Please provide written notification and phone call to homeowner before neighbor builds a two-story addition affecting trees, light, views and privacy.

- No Exceptions to the 35 % maximum lot coverage. 2. Building size and mass & scale within current parameters of 30 ft. height and 35% lot coverage should preserve the look of the Village no exceptions.
- I'm not opposed to voluntary design guidelines, but if they're voluntary, they would be unenforceable and could be disregarded.
- Note: I want the Village to be open to solar roofing panels, and to fresh design - but also to preserve space trees and sense of community
- Some prescriptive standards will be required.
- There has to be a balance between allowing for improvement, but preventing more mansionization and hodge podge nature of Edgemoor.
- No McMansions. Please keep the integrity of the Village
- In this survey we indicate that additional requirements are needed. However, we are very concerned about the ability of the Village to be able to establish clear guidelines, establish an expeditious process, or to even stick to its own guidelines.
- These issues will need to be addressed at the time any new requirements are considered.
- Anything voluntary will be ignored.
- Some neighbors don't feel that the Village protects some neighbors in the past perhaps because they didn't have more standards on the books.
- There are enough level of control for construction in the Village! To do construction in the Village a MC permit needs to be obtained and finally a Village permit needs to be obtained. It seems there are three levels of review one must go through which I believe is more than sufficient to control building in the Village
- Village should address height & size of bldg.
- As little as possible
- Prescriptive standards should be kept to a minimum, but retain reasonable lot coverage, etc., to avoid mansionization.

Comments for Survey Response: Add Additional Prescriptive Standards

- These standards must be mandatory. Four or five oversized homes have been built in the West area over the past four years & they have contributed to an ugly aesthetic, have dwarfed their neighbors homes & are environmentally unfriendly.
- It seems both prudent and necessary to control the tendency to construct mansions anywhere. In some parts of the Village, the older homes are mansions, and they fit, look great--there, but not everywhere.
- We believe that adding regulations is an important step to control development. It makes no sense for the Village not to take advantage of this opportunity. If we can create new regulations. Let's put some teeth into them.
- Need to add rear yard setback regulation
- Keep the neighborhood classic. "Voluntary" means nothing to the types of people who think McMansion are tasteful. They will stop at nothing to make enough room for their home theatres and items from the Front gate catalog.

- The Village should adopt additional regulations and standards related to the mass and scale of buildings in the Village. Voluntary standards should not be adopted- They will be ignored. If the Village is going to do something about the problem it should be binding.
- If one cannot live above a garage, why can a garage appear to be more than one story? Preserve sightlines, stop cutting down trees!
- Homeowners should be protected against loss of privacy, access to limit and sun and air because of a desire to conspicuously reflect wealth in the size or a house that over shadows existing construction.
- There are enough different styles of houses, and of additions, that sensible people should be able to design attractive houses & additions that will fit into the neighborhood. If they cannot do so, the Village should help set standards.
- Please keep size in proportion to existing houses & value green space & trees.
- One of the very important jobs of the Village is to manage the overall character of the housing stock. The houses in the Village generally are very large and extraordinarily nice. I believe that homeowners appreciate the characteristics of the Village and continuity from generation to generation. I worry that the character of the Village may be compromised if green spaces are replacing with square footage to already large homes.
- Should have maximum limit on size of newer or remodeled construction. Such as- Cannot exceed by more than x% of other homes within y feet of proposed building. There are some very large lots in Village. If lot coverage is only restriction, we could have real monstrosities.
- New construction and/or alterations should be compatible with neighbor's structures.
- A way must be found to protect the Villages' essential character without being too rigid and stifling the ability of property owner to manage their property - the key is balance
- Voluntary guidelines will not deter a few who will build to the max in all directions and destroy the streetscape. The tree canopy will be lost, esp. in rear yards.
- We should not get involved in design.
- If the Village adopts rigid standards today, reflecting the will of a vocal group and it's style preferences, it is inevitable that changes later in design, construction and living styles will make those standards obsolete and way too restrictive. Some modest changes may be appropriate, but not comprehensive strict standards.
- None. Only concern is "McMansion" problem and this is adequately addressed by height and lot coverage restrictions with refinements e.g., limit total volume of structures above 1 story. Allow 35% lot coverage, but only 20% lot coverage above 12 feet, or something like that.
- It is appealing to make design & building guidelines voluntary, but Edgemoor & Section 4 prove that's not a viable community option. We do not want the Village to follow those 2 examples of unbridled mansionization and damages to the natural environment.
- Voluntary is not likely to work. Developing side yards and dramatically redeveloping existing houses is often done at hands of folks who don't have sense of (how what they are doing affects) Village ambience. We can't pull up the gangplank or freeze the Village in time, but we need rules to prevent really inappropriate things from happening.
- Preserve character of existing neighborhood homes.
- Village regulations should reflect & reinforce the historical patterns of this historic district.
- Set back; tree preservation/replanting

- Design, for new construction should be compatible with existing houses! See house on Montgomery Street use an example of what not to approve!
- I don't think voluntary guidelines will reach the people who should be reached.
- There should be standards on distance between properties & height allowances
- Prevent McMansions!
- House/building heights, lot % coverage should be more stringent and measured more accurately w/o loopholes. 2. Find some mechanism to lassos the run-off/drainage issues with new construction. 3. Whether the new grading on redeveloped lots will affect water issues in neighboring lots and how to prevent/preclude this problem.
- Do not leave plan up to the Village Manager. I'm not happy with house at end of Hesketh near Wisconsin Ave. or the one on Montgomery just being finished.
- Procedural regulations should make it possible for residents to participate in and critique Village Manager's decision. The following should be published decisions subject to notice & comment prior to issuance of a building permit: 1. certification to the HPC that no variance is required; 2. Village arborist's acceptance rejection of a "tree preservation plan" 3. Village acceptance of a site plan or architectural drawing as adequate for review. 4. Any alteration to a site plan 1 architectural drawing pending with HPC by the Village. 5. Lap Decision
- No exception should be give to come closer to property line than is now allowed. No reducing front setbacks.
- I do not think a "modern" design is appropriate for the exterior of a Village addition, house, garage or other building visible on the outside.
- Guidelines and process should be consistent from Village to County to State (MD Historic Trust)
- Be practiced where necessary ie, driveway access width, existing shade trees "dying" that are a detriment to you and your neighbors
- Where radical alterations are proposed applicants should be required to construct simple models using plastic poles - as is done in other upscale jurisdiction - that give neighbors & others in the community a chance to see what the actual visual impact of interest mass or volume will be.
- I'm not opposed to voluntary design guidelines, but if they're voluntary, they would be unenforceable and could be disregarded.
- Tighter control needed.
- Some prescriptive standards will be required.
- "Voluntary design guidelines" would be pointless, and would only create neighborhood anger when they are ignored (as they would be). Existing do not cover all of the parameters necessary to prevent McMansionization. Must have regulations. No McMansions. Please keep the integrity of the Village
- A strong role for Village and resorts.
- On this survey we indicate that additional requirements are needed. However, we are very concerned about the ability of the Village to be able to establish clear guidelines, establish an expeditious process, or to even stick to its own guidelines. These issues will need to be addressed at the time any new requirements are considered.
- Anything voluntary will be ignored.

- The Village govt. has already seen by a previous survey that the majority of Village residents don't want mansionizing. If you read the history of the Village you will see that the Village was never meant to have "Potomac" type houses (we now have one on Lenox)!
- Village should regulate rear yard setback. Move than 20 feet, no exceptions.
- All things equal I would prefer locally based regulation rather than HPC but only if it were fair, informed and based on transparent/objective rules. As a broader reaching agency, HPC presumably has more resources and the ability to hire well-credentialed experts but this is out weighed by advantages of local regulation.
- Only to control "McMansionizing"
- Some neighbors don't feel that the Village protects some neighbors in the past perhaps because they didn't have more standards on the books.
- The following prescriptive standards are needed: 1) Height-clarify how it is measured-should be consistent and understandable to average citizen - also Village must have discretion to lower heights in certain, limited situations (new home sits on higher grade for ex.) 2) Lot Coverage - Should be Model D-25% this could be done thru a FAR standard. 3) Imperviousness - Restrict, because too much imperviousness is inconsistent with character it kills trees. Also causes serious storm water problems. 4) Setbacks - Give Village discretion to increase in certain special circumstances (privacy If unchecked, developers and homeowners will ruin the look of CCV with overly large, overly tall homes. Since the county has allowed so many clearly unsuitable homes to be built, it is up to the Village government to step into protect our community from mansionization. Large home on large lot? Fine! Large home on small lot? No!! I would like to add that I applaud the CCV Board of Managers for addressing this issue. There is no bigger issue for us today. We are at a crossroads in the history of CCV, and I only hope that there are enough people who cherish the beautiful neighborhoods here to return these (long) questionnaire and keep our streets style from mansionization.
- We need to be more restrictive.
- Rear yard setbacks. I am not sure how these mega-mansions can be built w/existing regulations although I guess there are creative ways to get around these rules. I am generally not in favor of more gov't intrusions but also not in favor of mansions that cover over neighbor's light space and garden.
- Prescriptive standards should be kept to a minimum, but retain reasonable lot coverage, etc., to avoid mansionization.

Comments for Survey Response: Add Voluntary Design Guidelines

- Not sure of definition of other two choices, but I hate too many restrictions but must be a balance between existing homeowners and the party proposing addition/construction. Voluntary will never be appropriate by itself. Not sure of definition of other two choices, but I hate too many restrictions but must be a balance between existing homeowners and the party proposing addition/construction. Voluntary will never be appropriate by itself.
- We have enough regulations in the Village and the County. Add to that the historic preservation aspect and we have all the controls needed. If the Board wishes to add some "voluntary" guidelines, that may be acceptable.

- We believe that adding regulations is an important step to control development. It makes no sense for the Village not to take advantage of this opportunity. If we can create new regulations. Let's put some teeth into them.
- Possibly the Village could take over role of county, as its requirements include the County's while adding other rules by allowing residents a one-stop shopping experience the process might well be more humans accessible. Going to redundant Board is time consuming at best...In this way the process might be shown to be a helpful one which benefits the Village, its residents & their property values. ~ possibly add voluntary design guidelines as to style of vegetation.
- There are enough different styles of houses, and of additions, that sensible people should be able to design attractive houses & additions that will fit into the neighborhood. If they cannot do so, the Village should help set standards.
- Rear yard setback is one area where regulation may be appropriate.
- The concept to preserve the historical look of Chevy Chase is well intended. The problem is lifestyles & standard have changed in the past 100 years as well as the quality of building materials. The process does not adequately recognize this or the spirit of a neighborhood. ie. Swing Sets.
- Should have maximum limit on size of newer or remodeled construction. Such as- Cannot exceed by more than x% of other homes within y feet of proposed building. There are some very large lots in Village. If lot coverage is only restriction, we could have real monstrosities.
- New construction and/or alterations should be compatible with neighbor's structures.
- A way must be found to protect the Villages' essential character without being too rigid and stifling the ability of property owner to manage their property - the key is balance
- Preserve character of existing neighborhood homes.
- Regulate lot coverage only.
- Same as above. I would hope that compliance would happen without a lot of new Village laws and the bureaucracy that would follow however, I realize that this could be difficult.

- Keep the present "character" of the Village Mansions - oversized not in keeping with Village should not be permitted.
- I do not think a "modern" design is appropriate for the exterior of a Village addition, house, garage or other building visible on the outside.
- Some prescriptive standards will be required.
- On this survey we indicate that additional requirements are needed. However, we are very concerned about the ability of the Village to be able to establish clear guidelines, establish an expeditious process, or to even stick to its own guidelines. These issues will need to be addressed at the time any new requirements are considered.
- The Village regulates tree removal and air conditioner but does not address the important matter of paving most of front lawns, sub grade walls and stairwells in setbacks and houses much too large for lots they are built on.
- Montgomery County Historic Commission requirements should be enough already.
- As little as possible

Comments for Survey Response: Add Voluntary Design Guidelines

- Not sure of definition of other two choices, but I hate too many restrictions but must be a balance between existing homeowners and the party proposing addition/construction. Voluntary will never be appropriate by itself. Not sure of definition of other two choices, but I hate too many restrictions but must be a balance between existing homeowners and the party proposing addition/construction. Voluntary will never be appropriate by itself.
- We have enough regulations in the Village and the County. Add to that the historic preservation aspect and we have all the controls needed. If the Board wishes to add some "voluntary" guidelines, that may be acceptable.
- We believe that adding regulations is an important step to control development. It makes no sense for the Village not to take advantage of this opportunity. If we can create new regulations. Let's put some teeth into them.
- Possibly the Village could take over role of county, as its requirements include the County's while adding other rules by allowing residents a one-stop shopping experience the process might well be more humans accessible. Going to redundant Board is time consuming at best...In this way the process might be shown to be a helpful one which benefits the Village, its residents & their property values. ~ possibly add voluntary design guidelines as to style of vegetation.
- There are enough different styles of houses, and of additions, that sensible people should be able to design attractive houses & additions that will fit into the neighborhood. If they cannot do so, the Village should help set standards.
- Rear yard setback is one area where regulation may be appropriate.
- The concept to preserve the historical look of Chevy Chase is well intended. The problem is lifestyles & standard have changed in the past 100 years as well as the quality of building materials. The process does not adequately recognize this or the spirit of a neighborhood. ie. Swing Sets.

- Should have maximum limit on size of newer or remodeled construction. Such as- Cannot exceed by more than x% of other homes within y feet of proposed building. There are some very large lots in Village. If lot coverage is only restriction, we could have real monstrosities.
- New construction and/or alterations should be compatible with neighbor's structures.
- A way must be found to protect the Villages' essential character without being too rigid and stifling the ability of property owner to manage their property - the key is balance
- Preserve character of existing neighborhood homes.
- Regulate lot coverage only.
- Same as above. I would hope that compliance would happen without a lot of new Village laws and the bureaucracy that would follow however, I realize that this could be difficult.

- Keep the present "character" of the Village Mansions - oversized not in keeping with Village should not be permitted.
- I do not think a "modern" design is appropriate for the exterior of a Village addition, house, garage or other building visible on the outside.
- Some prescriptive standards will be required.
- On this survey we indicate that additional requirements are needed. However, we are very concerned about the ability of the Village to be able to establish clear guidelines, establish an expeditious process, or to even stick to its own guidelines. These issues will need to be addressed at the time any new requirements are considered.
- The Village regulates tree removal and air conditioner but does not address the important matter of paving most of front lawns, sub grade walls and stairwells in setbacks and houses much too large for lots they are built on.
- Montgomery County Historic Commission requirements should be enough already.
- As little as possible

Question 11

When constructing a two-story building next door to a one-story home, a one-story section could be used along the side to reduce the perceived scale.

Comment for Survey Response: Require in Regulations

- If it helps control size.
- Given the choices I do not like to require but do not see anything to come if something is suggested. Needs to be something in middle.
- Otherwise new house looms over smaller house & blocks sunlight.
- Each of these points (11-16) are essential to prevent out of scale development. They should all be required for new building design.
- Just limit height & the other think won't be issues.
- Allows for new construction and additions, but helps to avoid precautions of building looming over neighbors
- With appeal w/ lawyer ~ 1. I question efficacy of Voluntary "Rule" . 2. Breaking-up massive scales desirable in the Village for visual harmony to preserve perceived special/desirable quality of our Village.
- Because of the inequity to the people with the smaller house.
- To prevent blockage of sunlight and/or sky
- I strongly favor compatibility of scale. This appears a helpful transition from smaller to larger.
- The major addition at 26 Oxford is shaping up very well. Why not use it as a model and apply whatever standards you applied there?
- With possibility for exceptions.
- I leave it to the experts as to the best way to achieve the overall objections.
- I feel over all mass/scale is what is important, so I would focus on that. Step down height may be a way to control mass & scale.
- To prevent situations where, for example, the larger house dominates the smaller, in some cases blocking light and views from windows.

- Please do everything to reduce huge construction. This reduces greenspace & can be disruptive to neighbors.
- People live in the Village because of its established character.
- I prefer voluntary guidelines on 11, 12 & 13, But am concerned people would totally ignore them.
- To maintain proportional esthetic on the street & not overwhelm the smaller house.
- Unless it's a required guideline, there will be homes that do not follow it. This seems like a modest reg. that can help preserve the neighborhood feel.
- The developer already preying on this neighborhood won't be dissuaded by voluntary guideline.
- Side yard additions often have a greater impact on neighbors than rear yard additions. They affect the light and air circulation. Large, unbroken side yard additions present a fortress-like appearance to the neighboring building.
- To protect neighbors from massive scale.
- Protect integrity of CC Village.
- To increase compatibility.
- If it's judged appropriate by the "architectural committee"
- In less specific way. I would suggest a regulation that requires the architects to address the problem but doesn't prescribe how. Prescribing a solution can lead to goofy results.
- Allow more light for the smaller neighbor as well as softening the impact of such disproportionate sizes.
- a major way to achieve compatibility
- Use FAR. Greater height should trigger greater setback
- Good idea
- It maybe too personal of an opinion, but I abhor monolithic, large, overbearing structures.
- Air & Light
- Evidence is ample that voluntary guidance are not observed - what happens to adjacent properties.
- No speculative builder is going to respect voluntary guidelines. His sole and honorable - mission is maximizing his profit. And no homeowner who wants a big house is going to voluntarily settle for a smaller house.
- looks better
- I am not aware of many 1-story building in the Village.
- It can totally block and sunlight and views of neighbors on several sides.
- Because X (ie me) lose light and privacy
- This is a great contextual idea for community design
- Properties need to not feel cluttered & humdrum.
- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- In order to avoid adversely impacting light availability and line of sight obstructions.
- No one will comply with voluntary guidelines- I would make them mandatory but with a fast and expedient appeals process.
- New house should not be allowed to tower over neighbors, block sunlight, and look down into neighbor's windows.
- When a large structure is built next to a smaller structure privacy is compromised as neighbors can look into windows. 9 ft. setback are very important to help with privacy and should be required with new construction.

- Will not happen otherwise. HPC has this authority and uses it. County and Village have not imposed step-down. When you compare the West to the Historic District, you can see the difference to detriment of West.
- Large homes next to one-story homes overwhelm the smaller home.
- Neighbor must be required to take into account height of neighboring homes. Not sure if this 1/2 height addition works or not.

Comments for Survey Response: Suggest in Voluntary Guidelines

- Given the choices I do not like to require but do not see anything to come if something is suggested. Needs to be something in middle.
- Private Property
- Our neighborhood is becoming ripe for teardowns. It makes more sense to come up with regulations that govern maximum size, density, height than regulations, relative to neighboring homes that may themselves be altered.
- It is important to avoid a large number of restrictions i.e., pick your battles and restrict the most egregious McMansions.
- Such a more thoughtful approach could become a new standard if voluntary guideline fails to take hold.
- Whether the new building scale is appropriate will depend on the lot sizes, the permanences of the neighboring structure, and other factors that will be specific to the project.
- Remember we are on east side--smaller lots to begin with.
- To prevent situations where, for example, the larger house dominates the smaller, in some cases blocking light and views from windows.
- There are few one-story buildings in the Village's historic area which concerns us the most
- If new construction is sufficiently distant from one-story home, then suggestion is sufficient.
- Are you suggesting that the one-story section be built even if not planned?
- Maybe require step-down if the setback is <10 feet? It's a combination of the 2 that causes problems--i.e. can't landscape to hide the neighbors.
- The house next door is likely to expand and increase its height over time.
- Situation is infrequent.
- Perhaps allow impacted neighbor to request.
- There are almost no one-story residence in the Village. But step down to one story at lot line may be desired.
- Allow more light for the smaller neighbor as well as softening the impact of such inappropriate sizes.
- I am concerned that the one-story home will be renovate & then the first person will be stuck & scale will no longer be relevant
- Let architect use good judgment
- Depends on context- distance from setback; age of house; smaller house could be on higher grade; etc. Need variance procedures & calculations if mandatory.
- Adds too much burden to homeowner to require architectural designing. Also doesn't allow new renovators to do that which other have done seems unfair to require

- This seems like a reasonable idea but I would not want to codify it. Due would hope the architects would take this into when suggesting design options.
- Owner of one story house may change to more stories in future defeating the purpose.
- the few 1 story homes if can recall are not "historic" & I don't think their neighbors should be restricted because of a home built in the 50 or 60's.
- Too many regulations
- There are very few one-story homes in the Village.
- Architects know all this - what % of CCV projects do not have architects?
- One story section
- One-Story homes are increasingly anomalous in the Village and are unattractive anyway.
- This is a great contextual idea for community design
- Design requirements are inappropriate for the Village. (2) It is inappropriate to set regulations based on the happenstance of
- the size or design of the neighbors.
- Enforce existing regulations, can overdo regulations, judgments of how effective measures are subjective.
- Every Case is different and fixed regulation could lead to problems/lost opportunities.
- It is unreasonable to assume that one-story buildings will remain so. They will eventually be expanded to 2 or more stories. This can be done in keeping with current Village building forms.
- So that the two-story building does not appear to overwhelm the one-story structure
- I do not believe there should be a restriction against a building a 2-story building next to a 1-story building
- It's fine to bring this method of doubt to a homeowner. Further should have the right to build as they need under existing regulations.
- This is pure aesthetics and not a proper issue for law.
- Additional overnight would be onerous
- Who's to say that the one story house won't raise the roof next year?
- Allowing individual creativity while indicating society's preferences can be expected to yield best outcome.
- May vary depending on specific style and design.

Comments for Survey Response: Take No Action

- Should not infringe on the right of property owner to build to accommodate neighbor.
- Regulate footprint & height, not design
- Because no one can take responsibility what will happen to "one story" home next year.
- Problem lies with 3-story buildings w/ 9-10 ft ceilings- not 2 story.
- Such a requirement is based on the assumption that the one-story home will remain given the location. The Village is not a good place for one-story homes.
- Aesthetic cannot be legislated. As long as the structure meets FAR, setback etc. requirements, that should be sufficient.
- 1--All improvements make all more valuable, 2--Still looks fine.

- Allow single stories to grow to 2 story, rather than restrict the owners. The lands values are too high to keep 1 level homes in place.
- I am concerned about unintended consequences including senselessly over zealous "enforcement" use of arbor regulation to steer business to keep deep pocketed providers is an example it had only increase cost to residents and raised questions about the propriety of administration
- You should not be restricted by your neighbor's house or economic status. Chevy Chase is very mixed in these terms and will cause great tension among neighbors.
- there are few on-story homes in CCV, and putting a two-story or three-story home next to one of them is consistent with current patterns! Additional regulation is not needed.
- Too arbitrary
- See response to items. Once something becomes "voluntary", it will later be converted to mandatory.
- Whatever restrictions are already imposed by Historic District Status are sufficient for that area. Other areas need nothing further. Also, what if neighbor w/1 story wants to put up a 2 story next year? That is a problem.
- Why prejudice the first owner? The second owner, if he chooses a build later, would be in a better position to build more.
- Because eventually the one-strong building would be popped up.
- I would encourage the sale and demolition of the one-story structure.
- One-story should not dictate what happens next door. If the one-story residence is later renovated to become a two-story structure, the prior 2-story owner would have been disadvantaged.
- Not that many 1-story homes in the Village.
- The possibility of one story putting on a top floor making stepping down a waste and then controls the original one-story to keep a step down.
- I do not want any "added requirement" existing regulations seem fine
- The Village is already over regulated and should focus on more important issues such as police protection for its resident.
- I don't think this should be mandated.
- Proportion should be based on scale of design not to a preexisting neighboring structure which may be improved for the better.
- One-story homes are out of character in the Village. A one story home should not adversely impact construction on a two-story home.
- Follow Montgomery County
- One story section should leave sufficient space between neighboring property--define in regulations.
- It has to be aesthetically pleasing for the house being renovated.
- I feel this should be the issue that a homeowner has control.
- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- UNFAIR to have a rule that depends on what is next door. We have 2-story & houses next to one-story structures already. Should be illegal. Violates "fair and reasonable criterion or p. 20 of report.
- Just use common sense please.
- I don't believe you should mandate whether one can take a small house with few bedrooms & baths up and make it remain so by restricting a 2-story addition.

- If a two-storey house is built next to a one-storey house a subsequent renovation of the one-storey house will be next to a two-storey house. The building code should be uniform for all.
- Current Montgomery County standards are adequate.

Question 12

One method of reducing perceived scale is to limit the “plate height” of walls on the side of the house closest to the neighbors. “Plate height” is the height of the wall where it meets the roof.

Comments for Survey Response: Require in Regulations

- Believe roof lines more important but not sure side yard setback necessary in every neighborhood.
- Some combination of setback and max pitch height. Space between neighbors and the height of walls are relevant to the feel of a neighborhood and privacy. Most of us can stand tightness on one side but not both.
- With appeal w/o lawyer. Seems like single most effective way to structure compatibility of scale. Reducing perceived scale is desirable goal within Village a sensitive appeal process must balance requirements.
- People won't do it voluntary.
- To prevent blockage of sunlight and/or sky.
- Loss of access to sun, light, air should be unacceptable to an existing neighborhood.
- Only if setback limit increased to the County limit.
- I strongly favor compatibility of scale. This appears a helpful transition from smaller to larger.
- The major addition at 26 Oxford is shaping up very well. Why not use it as a model and apply whatever standards you applied there?
- I leave it to the experts as to the best way to achieve the overall objections.
- I feel over all mass/scale is what is important, so I would focus on that. Step down height may be a way to control mass & scale.
- I feel over all mass/scale is what is important, so I would focus on that. Step down height may be a way to control mass & scale.
- Soaring houses could dramatically impact existing homes.
- Height can be more important to neighbors than other considerations.
- To keep scale of buildings in proportion.
- Unless it's a required guideline, there will be homes that do not follow it. This seems like a modest reg. that can help preserve the neighborhood feel.
- Side yard additions often have a greater impact on neighbors than rear yard additions. They affect the light and air circulation. Large, unbroken side yard additions present a fortress-like appearance to the neighboring building.
- It will hopefully protect the house next door.
- Protect integrity of CC Village.
- Depending on proximity to set back.
- If it's judged appropriate by the "architectural committee"

- Allow more light for the smaller neighbor as well as softening the impact of such disproportionate sizes.
- Would prevent "mcmansion" effect.
- Depends on what maximum height would be. Depends on context- how far procedures of mandatory. Plate height limit should decrease further in back along side of lot.
- Major way to achieve results we need.
- The wall is a massive structure that can obstruct a neighbor's view. It's height should be restricted & provide a visual easement to the neighbor nearest the wall.
- Again, it limits the temptation for designing one large block and give some variation with different heights.
- Air & Light
- Evidence is ample that voluntary guidance are not observed - what happens to adjacent properties.
- It's just so greedy and crass for an owner to stick immediate neighbors and the community with such disproportionate monoliths.
- Privacy & drainage neighbors are greatly impacted by big additions close or over lines
- To prevent massive McMansion
- This is a question of setback or distance from the neighbor's house. If only 7' from neighbor the plate height should be regulated.
- Because X (ie me) lose light and privacy
- Because the Village currently takes no account of the impact on neighbors and it should at least require some consultation to address the impact. The current system gives total control & to the developer as if no one else mattered.
- Side Yards are sometimes rather narrow.
- Neighbors cannot be trusted to care or worry about next-door neighbors.
- Walls & fences reduce the openness & feel of a community-fences don't make good neighbors.
- Because this is important
- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- In order to avoid adversely impacting light availability and line of sight obstructions.
- 25' reasonable with 35' ridgeline. 35' on side with flat roof totally out of character.
- No one will comply with voluntary guidelines- I would make them mandatory but with a fast and expedient appeals process. If it is important to preserve the CCV character, which we think it is, then there should be real rules that serve this
- The seven-foot side yard setback is a small area. New homes should be required to be 9 feet from setback if wall height is not restricted
- This is especially important when the new house or additions is at a higher elevations than the neighbor
- Will not happen otherwise. HPC has this authority and uses it. County and Village have not imposed step-down. When you compare the West to the Historic District, you can see the difference to detriment of West. On this issue, discretion on side setbacks is also important, because increased setback is another way to address problem.
- I could see these three changes being viewed together - it's possible that the new house plate height would be minimized in impact if the wall length were reduced.

Comments for Survey Response: Suggest in Voluntary Guidelines

- Believe roof lines more important but not sure side yard setback necessary in every neighborhood.
- Private Property
- Whether the new building scale is appropriate will depend on the lot sizes, the permanence of the neighboring structure, and other factors that will be specific to the project.
- Remember we are on east side--smaller lots to begin with.
- For reasons similar to those stated in #11. But not necessary to require in regulations.
- If new construction is sufficiently distant from neighbor's house, suggestion is sufficient.
- Same as above--restrict if not more than minimum setback?
- The house next door is likely to expand and increase its height over time.
- The angle of roofs may vary and a marginal room for error may be acceptable.
- Perhaps allow impacted neighbor to request.
- Allow more light for the smaller neighbor as well as softening the impact of such disproportionate sizes.
- Will look better but consideration of owner wishes should carry a lot of weight.
- Too many regulations
- Design requirements are inappropriate for the Village. (2) It is inappropriate to set regulations based on the happenstance of the size or design of the neighbors. Enforce existing regulations, can overdo regulations, judgments of how effective measures are subjective.
- I do not believe there should be a restriction against a building a 2-story building next to a 1-story building
- It is fine to show another way, but I didn't believe we should make regulations that mandate design.
- It's fine to bring this method of doubt to a homeowner. Further should have the right to build as they need under existing regulations.
- This is pure aesthetics and not a proper issue for law.
- Changes I the Village will happen and should not be restricted or else all property values suffer.
- Again, what's appropriate depends so much on the existing neighbor house & how it might be remodeled.
- Allowing individual creativity while indicating society's preferences can be expected to yield best outcome.
- May vary depending on specific style and design.

Comments for Survey Response: Take No Action

- Don't penalize homeowner wanting to add space.
- Regulate footprint & height, not design
- Because this would require in all fairness to write into the deed of the small house, that it would never be lifted higher than the other.
- Such a requirement is based on the assumption that the one-story home will remain given the location. The Village is not a good place for one-story homes.

- I am concerned about unintended consequences including senselessly over zealous "enforcement" use of arbor regulation to steer business to keep deep pocketed providers is an example it had only increase cost to residents and raised questions about the propriety of administration
- Same reasoning I would leave this up to the architect and judgment of homeowner. Green space rule will self enforce most issues. I would have an overall height restriction.
- The current height restriction, if enforced is sufficient to preserve the scale of the community.
- See response to items. Once something becomes "voluntary", it will later be converted to mandatory.
- Height is not the problem. Visible area is the problem i.e., height X width but only above a certain height Ex: for a 30ft high X 20ft wide wall, the problem is the 18ft X 20ft portion above 12 ft.
- Rely on height limits
- Why protect what is probably old, ugly & obsolete.
- This is very house specific.
- Limits ability to expand other homes in a meaningful way
- I do not want any "added requirement" existing regulations seem fine
- We cannot fully legislate good design - better to regulate design in terms of : comports with streetscape, lot coverage, and massing which fits in context like models c & d pp 9-10.
- Homes in Chevy Chase Village are typically grand in scale and large. A smaller home should not have an adverse effect on the building of homes, larger homes which are more typically sought after by families interested in living in Chevy Chase and having amenities expected in the 21st century.
- Follow Montgomery County
- Consider setting limits for floor-to-floor heights instead.
- Again, it is worse to hobble the aesthetics of a renovation to create an ugly house.
- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- Again, the code should be uniform and not dependent on the closeness to the neighbor. If the existing neighboring house is right on the side set back, the resident planning new construction should not be penalized if he wishes to do the same.
- Current Montgomery County standards are adequate.

Question 13

One means of reducing perceived scale is to establish a maximum length for a building wall that reflects the size of nearby buildings. Larger buildings could use jogs or offsets to create modules that reflect these established building sizes.

Comments for Survey Response: Require in Regulations

- Voluntary Guidelines are ineffective because they are not enforceable.
- Do not like boxes to max floor space/living area & think that's what most people dislike.
- Additions to existing bonuses often use this idea in their design - it should be encouraged & required.

- I currently face a large wall in my backyard. Would have been nice to have it broken-up.
- This is a third method which might be suitable some properties. Appeal process should be sensitive & balancing individual situations & not so onerous to need legal representation.
- To prevent crowding too much building on a confined space.
- I strongly favor compatibility of scale. This appears a helpful transition from smaller to larger.
- The major addition at 26 Oxford is shaping up very well. Why not use it as a model and apply whatever standards you applied there?
- I leave it to the experts as to the best way to achieve the overall objections.
- I feel over all mass/scale is what is important, so I would focus on that. Step down height may be a way to control mass & scale.
- To maintain character of neighborhood.
- For reasons as above.
- good idea
- Unless it's a required guideline, there will be homes that do not follow it. This seems like a modest reg. that can help preserve the neighborhood feel.
- It would scale down larger buildings to be more compatible with current & historic homes in keeping with original intent.
- Side yard additions often have a greater impact on neighbors than rear yard additions. They affect the light and air circulation. Large, unbroken side yard additions present a fortress-like appearance to the neighboring building.
- To help keep certain characteristics of neighborhood.
- Protect integrity of CC Village.
- High Priority!
- If it's judged appropriate by the "architectural committee"
- Like the idea of breaking long walls visually.
- Major way to achieve desired results.
- If the Village wants this limit of control it should require site plan design approval.
- Evidence is ample that voluntary guidance are not observed - what happens to adjacent properties.
- Proportion
- For both 12 & 13 we all should chip to whatever makes our surroundings more civilized and makes us feel less hemmed -in.
- To prevent massive McMansion
- Consideration to impacts to immediate neighbor should be a factor
- Because the current system says anything goes - you want to build a mansion we in the Village will rubber stamp it.
- People will take as much space as they want so must be regulated.
- Walls & fences reduce the openness & feel of a community-fences don't make good neighbors.
- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- In order to avoid adversely impacting light availability and line of sight obstructions.
- No one will comply with voluntary guidelines- I would make them mandatory but with a fast and expedient appeals process. If it is important to preserve the CCV character, which we think it is, then there should be real rules that serve this objective. These

requirements strike me as parameters within which a talented architect can easily work. Maybe we should have a voluntary board of architectural advisors.

- Large rectangular houses that fill 35% of lot look like a bed and breakfast at the beach. "Sleep 16, parking for 6"
- This would help with privacy, reduce air & light
- Again HPC already does this County & Village do not.
- Breaking up the wall length reduces the mass.

Comments for Survey Response: Suggest in Voluntary Guidelines

- Do not like boxes to max floor space/living area & think that's what most people dislike.
- In order not to create opportunity to play favoritism (or worse) by the decision-makers.
- Private Property
- The issue in this case is yard, not building.
- Whether the new building scale is appropriate will depend on the lot sizes, the permanence of the neighboring structure, and other factors that will be specific to the project.
- Remember we are on east side--smaller lots to begin with.
- To try to achieve the stated effect.
- This is generally a good idea, but it will not work for all circumstances.
- There may be exceptional reasons to allow a greater length, but a strong case would have to be made to other authorities.
- Least restrictive way to achieve Voluntary Action.
- Let architect use good judgment
- Depends -context
- If the Village wants this limit of control it should require site plan design approval.
- I am not sure about this limit
- An owner deserves to have some flexibility and creativity in designing outside surface.
- Too strict
- This doesn't seem as crucial to me as the two optimum above it would have less effect on streetscape
- Design requirements are inappropriate for the Village. (2) It is inappropriate to set regulations based on the happenstance of
- the size or design of the neighbors.
- Every Case is different and fixed regulation could lead to problems/lost opportunities.
- It really has to be case by case depending on lot and project.
- It is fine to show another way, but I didn't believe we should make regulations that mandate design.
- It's fine to bring this method of doubt to a homeowner. Further should have the right to build as they need under existing regulations.
- This is pure aesthetics and not a proper issue for law.
- May vary depending on specific style and design.

Comments for Survey Response: Take No Action

- Perceived scale is not an issue.
- Regulate footprint & height, not design
- I am concerned about unintended consequences including senselessly over zealous "enforcement" use of arbor regulation to steer business to keep deep pocketed providers is an example it had only increase cost to residents and raised questions about the propriety of administration
- Will create too much "cut" look and end up with a neighborhood with a lot of obvious additions versus trying to blend best with original architecture.
- See response to items. Once something becomes "voluntary", it will later be converted to mandatory.
- If mass and scale are appropriate seems unnecessary.
- This is really stupid. How is this useful? The wall effectively is connected!
- I don't favor protection of smaller dwellings.
- Limits ability to expand other homes in a meaningful way
- I do not want any "added requirement" existing regulations seem fine
- I do not like the idea of jig-saw "jogs"
- Too many regulations
- it is difficult to base regulation on a house next door. The key is good design but we cannot legislate good taste - Stick to massing limitations and maintain good setback at back of a house as well as sides.
- Jogs or offsets would appear to create strange structures. Both architecturally on the exterior and the interior spaces. This could adversely affect existing floor plans and close off rooms & windows. The preference for seamless design & expansion would be destroyed. This would have great negative effects.
- Follow Montgomery County
- This question is not clear needs more explanation
- I'm just not comfortable requiring--or even suggesting--things that are essentially aesthetic considerations.
- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- Should be one rule for area, not dependent on "nearby" buildings. Wall length should be restricted, though. Jogs don't help much.
- Should not be necessary if lot coverage and mass scale compatibility are met
- Reflecting the size of nearby buildings implies different regulations depending on the existing nearby houses. The existing situation changes, e.g. the house across the street was approximately tripled in size some years ago (subsuming the original tiny house). The new house was not compatible in mass and scale, building form or lot coverage with the nearby houses. However, the neighborhood has adjusted and today the house seems to "belong". Thus, "standards" change as the neighborhood evolves.
- More important to have a rear setback & side setbacks that allow for breathing space around the house.
- We see little social gain from the observation of these limits.
- Current Montgomery County standards are adequate. This survey asks nothing about our opinion of who requires, how, or when new regulations matter. This survey asks

NOTHING about financial impact on homeowners or Village of changing regulation. It also does not ask about willingness of Village or citizens to assume litigation costs if new regulations are imposed. Very poorly conceived.

Question 14

Current lot coverage regulations address structures only, but all hard surfaces contribute to storm water run-off. An "impervious coverage" regulation could include all hard surfaces. This includes building roofs, patios and driveways (all gray surfaces at right).

Comments for Survey Response: Require in Regulations

- We've experienced increased flooding after neighbors renovations; one persons additions affect others properties; this is not just an individual homeowners decision.
- Storm water run-off & sewer backups are big problem in west area of Village & this contributes. Storm water run-off & sewer backups are big problem in west area of Village & this contributes.
- Should not risk damage to neighbor's property.
- And require drainage to gutters or French drains.
- Runoff is serious problem for everyone in a neighborhood.
- This is very important to regulate. This deterioration of the Bay is on-going & is greatly affected by run-off.
- Don't want to live in a concrete wasteland.
- Water Management Should be addressed comprehensively by the County. The Village require tree & shrub plantings.
- need to know more ~ I don't understand alternatives a house needs a roof a front walk customarily a hard surfaces would stone, brick set in sand (no mortar), gravel driveways raised decks cover (grass/dirt) be ok?
- Mostly to limit "extreme" cases of paving or adding hard surfaces.
- Concern for the environment.
- Keep a balance between city and country.
- Environmental concerns.
- Run-off has been a serious problem for neighbors in Martin's Additions.
- Because run off can detrimentally affect neighbors' property, public walkways and the environment.
- Run-off affects neighbors directly as well as environments.
- Potential impact of run-off on adjacent property.
- Same as before, disruptive, please keep integrity.
- Regulation should take into account nature of run-off problem.
- To guard against an excess of impervious coverage.
- need to minimize run-off with permissive use of porous hard surfaces for driveways, patios, etc.
- reduces run-off to neighbors
- We do have water drainage problems.

- To reduce storm water run-off directly into streets & sewers- making for a more environmentally sound situation.
- Water run-off from surface can have tremendous impact on surrounding neighbors & environment.
- Limiting impervious surfaces protect neighbors from unwelcome flooding, wet basements, etc.
- Water run-off is a big problem.
- Would require adequate run-off protection for neighboring properties to prevent erosion.
- Because otherwise adjacent areas might be changed.
- Vitally important to run-off CO₂, absorption, heat & etc.
- We need to step to the plate on this- run-off is killing our rivers and bay. It also wastes water that could reduce demand for water for landscape. WSSC
- Allow "soft mortar" exceptions.
- Storm water run-off from impervious surface contributes to pollution
- Run-off often affects neighbors.
- But, only if environmental issues are involved.
- Ecologically we need to control water management
- I favor considering limits on impervious surfaces, but making clear that a lesser limit applies to the structure
- Run-off water, flooding etc. are increased problems in the Village
- Important not to have too much run-off
- Wet basements are a serious problem already.
- Very important! We have experienced tremendous increase in run-off from construction of home adjacent from us. It affects water deposited in our lower lying yard, including its negative impact on health of our trees.
- But be sensible. For example, exempt gravel surfaces and others like flagstones and brick set in soil.
- I am concerned about drainage and flooding
- Important to minimize environmental impact.
- Run-off of storm water can adversely affect neighbors
- because with no regulation in place, people may consider their personal preferences in way that may be deleterious to their neighbors
- This is the simplest piece of ours to quantify and there are ways to limit this while allowing improvements
- Seems like a good idea, but would existing surfaces be able to be repaired/replaced? Even if not in compliance with rest?
- To ameliorate Village drainage problems
- Impervious coverage greatly increases runoff contributing to flooding and pollutions.
- Must be very restrictive as water run off has to be regulated or will end up with another mound where water runs off and sits on yard. Do not mound-up earth to re-direct the run-off already in rules but not enforced by Village.
- Too many hard services would create environmental problems for the entire neighborhood.
- Too much should not be covered.
- Drainage is a serious issue.

- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- To avoid run off of excess water from neighbors homes!
- Hardscape damages environment. Different rules for permeable driveways, patios/decks. (Do question how permeable some surfaces are.)
- Not only is this aesthetically important, but it's also important to environmental management (storm water, radiant heat, etc...)
- One of the major complaints of people next to or behind a large structure with a significant amount of impervious surfaces is the water run-off into their yards and basements
- Neighbors near homes with a lot of impervious coverage experience soggy yards and water in basements
- Village is experiencing tree loss, and stormwater management problems. These will worsen over time unless there is greater regulation of imperviousness coverage.
- Run-off affects\ damages property beyond one's own property.
- If water runoff has a negative effect on a neighbor's yard that should be addressed.
- Too many people would ignore voluntary guidelines. This is an important issue & should be required in regulations
- Because of problems with drainage and run-off, we may want to consider introducing new regulations to control runoff and reduce impervious coverage. New regulations would have to contend with thorny issues relating to existing circumstances.
- Storm water runoff is an issue that effects everyone
- Voluntary guidelines have no teeth.
- There is a strong social interest in limiting unnecessary impervious coverage.
- A growing problem in Village.

Comments for Survey Response: Suggest in Voluntary Guidelines

- Storm water run-off is major concern and this can be handled through proper drainage.
- Suggestion: Where more "impervious coverage" is sought the Village can impose a drainage system diverting water to the public drainage system. Nobody should be forced to keep lawns.
- To allow some flexibility of individual choice while promoting a desired goal.
- Recent new homes seem to have a lot of concrete or asphalt.
- Should be sufficient to guide acceptable use of lot
- We have enough regulations
- Some homes in Village have high ratio of driveways, patios & look beautiful. Depends on context, materials etc.
- There maybe additional way to abort run-off such as vegetation or wells that would help offset the run-off from impervious structures. The idea would be not do increase run-off by a certain amount. How you do it could be the responsibility of the owner/ builder, within prescribed guidelines.
- Any installation of patio should require substantial & carefully planned drainage.
- Too many regulations

- Many roof lines in Village include dormers & porches which make a home go over, but which add to charm.
- Seems like a good idea, but would existing surfaces be able to be repaired/replaced? Even if not in compliance with rest?
- Hard to dictate landscaping choices.
- This is an important environmental considerations but not necessarily a mass/scale/form issue in all parts of this Village.
- Is run-off a problem? Does it affect other people? If so, and only in such cases should regulations be imposed. Each case should be looked into individually to determine the effect on neighbors. The regulations should only concern expected volume of run-off.

Comments for Survey Response: Take No Action

- I could see a lot of gravel driveways being built. Why not require better engineering of home drain systems?
- I am concerned about unintended consequences including senselessly over zealous "enforcement" use of arbor regulation to steer business to keep deep pocketed providers is an example it had only increase cost to residents and raised questions about the propriety of administration
- Homeowner decision and in the grand scheme not relevant.
- Too burdensome for homeowners who have not completed their home improvements
- See response to items. Once something becomes "voluntary", it will later be converted to mandatory.
- It will be critical that WSSC expand sewer capacity if no action is taken.
- Just require some sort of engineer approval of no impact re run-off.
- Structure count-regulators. Keep looking for things to regulate.
- I thought there was an imperious cover limit.
- Too limiting
- I do not want any "added requirement" existing regulations seem fine
- Patios and driveway add to charm of property and take car from street to garage- most houses already have one or both.
- Roof lines patios & driveways are already considered by HPC regulations.
- Follow Montgomery County
- Small rules that serve no big tree purpose interfere with homeowner's ability to make improvements.
- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- Need more research - In cases where garage location was located to preserve trees - then that homeowner should not be penalized solely on impervious coverage. Under those situations - property & impervious surfaces Needs more research
- Would want to see what such a regulation would say first. It could be draconian.
- Current adequate

Question 15

One option is to establish a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR), which is directed at keeping

the size of a building in proportion to its lot. By providing an allowed FAR, the maximum overall mass and scale of a structure is set, however a designer would have flexibility in the design within the FAR limit

Comments for Survey Response: Require in Regulations

- Only way to deter max bldg but need some relief for certain circumstances.
- Sounds good.
- Design flexibility is necessary to maintain design variety.
- Because it would be meaningless without it.
- Prevent excessively large buildings
- Excellent idea! Allows design flexibility.
- Context is important
- This one regulation would solve most of the problems this section addresses.
- Definitely provides some neighborhood compatibility without interfering with design.
- "Voluntary" action is not dependable.
- But limit vertical height as well.
- Some limit on lot utilization should be required.
- Preserve character of neighborhood.
- This goes along way to self- regulate over building on a lot.
- To keep buildings a reasonable size in proportion to other lot.
- Should have maximum limit on size of newer or remodeled construction. Such as- Cannot exceed by more than x% of other homes within y feet of proposed building. There are some very large lots in Village. If lot coverage is only restriction, we could have real monstrosities.
- Along with limits to lot coverage.
- FAR alone won't solve problems. See previous page comments. Some designs meet FAR but offer undesirable side yard heights and lengths.
- FAR limit are the best way to regulate scale and bulk, and it preserves design flexibility. But the closer FAR must not equal the smallest houses in the Village!
- But make it very large and FAR does not seem right. Concern is volume from outside view. Large atrium is just as bad as two floors.
- This seems fine as the property in effect would be become ?
- Provides flexibility
- This works in a commercial context. Should work here. But not with other limits that would. Restrict flexibility.
- This would need to be fine tuned perhaps block by block.
- Prohibit FAR as an option
- Would assure appropriate proportionality
- These make more sense than arbitrary plate height, wall length, or step-down limits
- Allows flexibility w/o losing control of size.
- I think this offers needed flexibility in meeting standards of mass & scale that should be part of the Chevy Chase Village Building Code.
- Scale is crucial

- Limits are pushed too often
- Again to vary the mass & reduce the impression of size.
- I like because it gives residents max. flexibility.
- To minimize mass
- Best way to control massing. However, there must be a sliding scale depending on lot size, i.e. a small lot would have a higher FAR (Say 50%) than large lot (say 30%)
- Because some of these huge homes sitting on small lots are just an abomination architecturally, environmentally & socially
- Keep character prevent crowding and ensure privacy
- There must be a sliding scale depending on lot size.
- Because if you don't do this you will perpetuate what going on regret now - new owners, developers & other pushing lot coverage to the max
- This could combat mansionization while still allow renovations & additions
- With me FAR over building may result.
- Building should be proportional to size of lot--example cited in response to item #5 is an example of how not to have building in conformance & size of lot.
- Seems to be an effective means of constraining proportionality in relation to adjacent houses.
- This would give more flexibility
- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- To avoid mansionization in the Village
- This somewhat conflicts with #14, because making structure less tall leads to more lot coverage.
- As long as the limit was reasonable and subject to appeal--I would not include sub grade space in the FAR.
- I believe this is most important regulation needed.
- This is the most important regulations
- This is probably the single most important thing that can be done - as long as consistent with 25% lot coverage. Once the house is too large, you have lost compatibility, and other regs are just chasing problems, but not catching them.
- Is a possibility but can't answer in isolation of other possibilities.
- FAR is the 1st step in preventing overly large houses. Must be required, not voluntary.
- Very carefully written to avoid excessive restrictions. Give architect great flexibility.
- Ensure option for improvement
- Would like to limit lot coverage to 25% of lot-but also maintain set backs.

Comments for Survey Response: Suggest in Voluntary Guidelines

- We already have a FAR 35% of lot coverage.
- Are the examples shown equivalent? (A) Would be too massive in my mind, but all the alternative acceptable. Thus, I don't know how to answer question #15 vis-à-vis presents regulation.
- A FAR is desirable, but should not be imposed.
- Voluntary guidelines would allow flexibility for particular situation

- We have enough regulations
- Voluntary is OK as long as 14 is required
- Design is voluntary.
- Case by Case analyze the volume of run-off and its affect. Regulations should define acceptable run-off not a prescription.
- Allowing individual creativity while indicating society's preferences can be expected to yield best outcome.

Comments for Survey Response: Take No Action

- Stick with lot percentage not micromanage property design.
- You already have a far basis vis-à-vis, lot coverage, height & set back - FAR has no basis in below-grade space uses
- FAR is the only objective criterion; together with MLC (max. lot coverage) it should be all what is needed.
- doesn't restrict excessive mass.
- I am concerned about unintended consequences including senselessly over zealous "enforcement" use of arbor regulation to steer business to keep deep pocketed providers is an example it had only increase cost to residents and raised questions about the the propriety of administration
- See response to items. Once something becomes "voluntary", it will later be converted to mandatory.
- Seems most intrusive
- Too limiting
- I do not want any "added requirement" existing regulations seem fine
- This is little to no total new construction - most is "additions" - I think the existing regs are sufficient.
- This would result in odd improvements. Property owners should be allowed to design their renovations within the existing strict regulations enforced by HPC. Additional controls would restrict property owners too much.
- Lot coverage, setbacks and height regulations should provide needed protections.
- Not necessary
- If there are changes, they must be regulated, if current regulations are more stringent no need for change.
- Does not Control Bulk!!
- An FAR may be deceiving with that there may be a certain amount of FAR but useable because it may conflict with lot coverage and height restrictions.
- There doesn't seem to be much point in introducing FAR as long as we are content with height, set back and lot coverage regulations.
- Current adequate

Question 16

One option is to change the way height is measured. Because the current measurement of

building height uses only the average existing finished grade at the front of a building, it does not take into consideration additional wall that will be exposed when the site slopes downhill to the rear.

Comments for Survey Response: Refine Existing Height Regulations

- Can always get around heights by changing front finished grade- should take into account where there is a difference.
- Maximum height should include all construction.
- Keeps appropriate scale.
- Doing so would prevent massive structures affecting neighbors' back yards, etc.
- There is too much possibility of abuse with the height taking advantage of a slope.
- Prevent excessively large buildings
- By impact on neighbor.
- current method can result in a four-story rear.
- Refine to eliminate current confusion.
- Clarify.
- To keep height within desired limits.
- Preserve character of neighborhood.
- So there is some means of controlling this aspect of the building.
- This is important for all neighbors.
- Great idea- for example of what we don't want on a slope. See a new house at Leland and Woodbine.
- Best way to achieve attractive building.
- Refine Existing Height Regulations
- To limit mass
- Height is crucial
- The new "mansions" loom over the existing structures. We live in our area where homes are already very close to each other. The existing height limits permit buildings that effectively bring our neighbors into our own living rooms.
- Do everything to keep height down with no loopholes
- Many new house dwarf the surrounding house DC of height.
- Height needs to be adjusted to consider its impact on adjacent properties
- Don't put up walls & fences.
- Regulations should address lot coverage & design as well.
- There should be a height limit but I am not clear what it should be.
- Need maximum height from all grades. Some new houses in county are four stored structures in part of house. Also don't allow very high height in part of roofline over the 35-foot mark. (See Hesketh Street new construction.)
- Max. height should be measured from the lowest grade otherwise a sloping property can result in a 4-story house that adversely affects neighbors. Builders can "play games" with how the height is measured and again it's the neighbors that are adversely affected.
- The height measuring regs from the County are a regulatory nightmare and must be changed to deal with terracing, normal grade changes, and to insure consistent results and a standard definition. Right now, County's Department of Permitting Services has

myriad, different interpretations. Plus, Village needs authority to lower heights to insure other houses aren't in shadow or otherwise significantly affected in adverse way.

- Elevations greatly impact the feel of mass - not sure though - regulations can be written for every situations
- There are too many loopholes in existing regulations. Anything such as maximum height should be carefully reviewed to make sure people aren't finding ways to build structures that are too high, oppressive and loom over neighbors.
- We need enforcement

Comments for Survey Response: Suggest in Voluntary Guidelines

- Not necessary to require this.
- We have enough regulations
- One could also suggest certain landscaping design that could lower the perceived height and the side of the downhill slope.
- Allowing individual creativity while indicating society's preferences can be expected to yield best outcome.

Comments for Survey Response: Take No Action

- Streetscape is of much more importance than side yard. Already regulated by lot coverage.
- Slope is "punishment" enough ~ depending on lines of site. Topography should be a consideration, more so at the front. What if one property is next to hilltop house? The scale of the higher house will dwarf the one at the bottom of a hill. This problem is similar to the example above where the back of property would be perceived as too high, too massive, to a nearby the higher back neighbor.
- I think this evens itself out!!
- Changing the height could make for such ludicrous structures no one would want one.
- I am concerned about unintended consequences including senselessly over zealous "enforcement" use of arbor regulation to steer business to keep deep pocketed providers is an example it had only increase cost to residents and raised questions about the propriety of administration
- See response to items. Once something becomes "voluntary", it will later be converted to mandatory.
- Recent changes in County law fixed almost all of the important issues on this topic.
- Front height restrictions are enough.
- Existing rules ok; not many slopes in the Village.
- Too limiting
- Visually not an issue from the street.
- I do not want any "added requirement" existing regulations seem fine
- Current height constraints are fine.
- If drainage issues are well managed it is the back of the house & the % of lot coverage is the main issue.
- I do not object to a house having a single height, not being forced to "step down", so to speak.

- Sloping conditions in the Village are rare. No action necessary especially since an expansion or addition on a slope would be less noticeable anyway. It is important to allow similar scale with grandness of existing properties found in section 2.
- Don't overdue it
- Doesn't seem to be a problem in Village.
- Flexibility for renovation.
- Taller houses are incompatible.
- What we have now works.
- Existing requirements is fair.
- Taking the average does not penalize properties that have difficult topography.
- Our primary consideration should be streetscape. Height regulations should be consistent for all buildings and measured, as it is currently, from the front yard grade. We might want to consider writing into our height regulation some sort of prohibition against regarding to favor higher structures.
- We're not very hilly so it doesn't seem like much of an issue. And, as noted before, I'd rather be up & leave more greenspace.
- Current adequate

Question 18

One could minimize the visual impact of driveways and garages, by limiting the percentage of a front facade allocated to garage doors and limiting the number of curb cuts.

Comments for Survey Response: Require in Regulations

- We don't have many bonuses with garages in front-let's keep that option limited.
- CC Village should not look like McLean-keep garages in the back, or minimized.
- depending on lot size & paving allocations. This would have to be decided in, conjunction with allowable driveway paving to me it's desirable limit curb cuts on small lots & to minimize garage doors visible front façade minimizing the amount or number of garage doors in a front facade might, essentially, require a garage orientation in such a way to need additional (paved) driveway.
- Because it's ugly.
- Prevent Excess
- Garage doors are ugly, lots have are big enough (still) to accommodate alternatives to 2 or 3 car front garages.
- Visible examples are out of character with neighboring houses.
- Large front garages have never been a Village feature. There is no need to follow trends from other suburbs.
- To improve appearance. Too much garage façade harms the appeal of houses and neighborhoods. But this regulation should have a grandfather clause.
- To maintain character of the Village.
- ought to prevent piling cars up in short driveways and blocking sidewalks, something that occurs too frequently in CCV.
- visual improvement

- to minimize the visual impact of garages on fronts of houses
- Pet peeve--big garage doors almost like only cars live there.
- Organized and dominant garages preserve look.
- Garages are ugly! I don't mind curb cuts though.
- Will force larger lots
- Sheer aesthetics
- House with huge garages don't fit & look terrible here.
- This would also help limit the number of cars that could be parallel in a driveway.
- It could prevent 3 car garage in the Village
- I thought there were regulations
- Garages in the front are ugly
- Hate looking at garages
- Large garage doors diminish the residential look of a house. Prefer they be on the side or rear, allowing more space for a porch.
- This is not currently a huge problem to maintain the current look of the Village you need to limit these. Its about preservation. Limitations could be a reasonable approach
- Garages are given too much importance in some new houses.
- Garage doors should not be allowed on front façade, unless there is absolutely no other design option. Garages are not front doors.
- If not limited currently, should be required in regulations to enhance compatibility.
- The garage should not be the primary feature of the front of a house.
- The new house on Montgomery Street has made the double garage most prominent
- These front - loaded 2 car garage models are out of character with Village and thousands lots of imperviousness. The use of this model is another big reason other parts of Chevy Chase now look like new subdivision.
- I don't like 3 car garages, could require different design (French Door) for the 3rd garage door. The benefit of front facing garages is that there is less driveway. 18A. Height of Auxiliary buildings needs to be regulated.
- I don't think people fully understand how driveways and (especially garages) contribute to an unpleasant pedestrian experience. I wish all garages & driveways could be in alley's behind homes. In the areas that have them (like across Western in CC DC it is much nicer & friendlier. People not cars.
- Garages in front disrupt the consistency of the Village.
- Limit front garage door space BUT do not limit curb cuts: May have needed for wheel chair or other disability access.
- Allowing individual creativity while indicating society's preferences can be expected to yield best outcome.

Comments for Survey Response: Suggest in Voluntary Guidelines

- Garages don't bother me and off-street parking is necessary.
- Reduction of on-street parking is desirable.
- Visual impact may vary by project.
- There are many 35' high bldgs and garages in front already.

- This is more of a design issue.
- Let architects use judgment
- Some people have no other choice, better in a garage than on street
- Limitations could be a reasonable approach
- Depends on individual house
- Case-by-Case analysis the volume of run-off and its affect. Regulations should define acceptable run-off not a prescription.

Comments for Survey Response: Take No Action

- Infringement of property owner as a matter of taste.
- You enter here the question of "tastes"
- The horse is out of the Barn! We're become urban! We need to think of ourselves as Georgetown with all its attendant traffic and encourage our community to provide off street parking for themselves!
- The number of garage bays is a bigger issue. Village has no alleys, lots not large enough for side entry garages-and adding would increase impervious coverage-bad.
- Present regulations adequate.
- Parking is so restricted that all residences in a neighborhood benefit from a circular driveway.
- This might minimize the number of lots that can be garaged.
- The reality today is that people have 3 cars.
- I am concerned about unintended consequences including senselessly over zealous "enforcement" use of arbor regulation to steer business to keep deep pocketed providers is an example it had only increase cost to residents and raised questions about the the propriety of administration
- Lot dictates this as well as vehicle size
- See response to items. Once something becomes "voluntary", it will later be converted to mandatory.
- Not necessary. I trust the design integrity of owners, architects and builders.
- Most lots so small that making any of these work will automatically restrict. Parking is getting harder and should be in plain view of owner.
- I do not want any "added requirement" existing regulations seem fine
- Only way to really "minimize" the impact of driveways is for all houses to be on carriage blocks with alleys and that horse is already out of the barn already.
- This could lead to odd working or out of character garages.
- What we have works.
- Allowing garages to the front of properties enables more open space in the rear yards.
- Although front facing garage doors are not attractive, introducing a new regulation relating to garage doors would put a number of existing structures out of compliance. The problem of curb cuts and driveways is related to problems of run off and impervious surfaces which we may want to regulate.
- Too minor-& whether it's intrusive really depends on character of the street.

Question 20

In general, should the materials of public sidewalks vary within the Village as they currently do, or should they be consistent throughout?

Comments for Survey Response: Be Consistent

- Public areas should be uniform as a matter of equity.
- No need to replace existing walks, but all new walks should be game/good quality
- All brick please!
- Build new sidewalks, but make sure new "pavers" or bricks are easy to ride bikes/scooters on. Otherwise, kids will ride in the street instead.
- Safety.
- East area doesn't look like it belongs as part of the Village, especially east of Brookville.
- Uniformity
- More attractive
- Aesthetically more agreeable.
- For uniformity & appearance. I also improve quality of new brick. Come on our block was rotten from appearance before installation and now is crumbling as could have been predicted.
- Historic area needs good historic walks
- Why should they be different?
- I like the brick and it would be nice to see it used throughout.
- Continue to overall cohesiveness of CCV.
- I like brick, but not enough to tear out existing sidewalks would suggest brick as replacement is needed.
- Sidewalks are necessary and desirable. Consistency increases safety margins.
- Handicap Access
- The "look" of CCV enhances its desirability
- Except on Brookville Road where a serious walkway is most desirable.
- Cohesive historical appearance
- And they should be higher quality than the new fake brick stuff they're using it crumbles.
- It is so sad that the original brick sidewalks were "repaired" with new brick the old walks were charming.
- Prefer uniform brick sidewalks provided non-slippery brick are used.
- Why not!
- Consistency is desirable aesthetically, but issues of cost & safety are also relevant.
- Use real brick everywhere
- Don't like hodge-podge.
- Brick should be maintained-key to Village character
- Within reason-variety of similar brick surfaces ok but not concrete
- If the Village owns the sidewalks then they might as well make them look uniform.
- Looks better. Also people should not be allowed to take their driveway paving material and interrupt the sidewalk with it...(see attached graphic on page 6)
- The brick sidewalk are much more attractive benefit entire ambiance of Village.

Comments for Survey Response: Vary

- No need to regulate that as it doesn't affect overall aesthetic or environmental runoff.
- I prefer concrete but not sure who likes the brick pavers but like diversity.
- Use common sense.
- too expensive to force consistency now
- Well, they do now. No need to tear up the old ones.
- Adds to charm
- Part of the charm of the Village is that is not informed-houses, street, sidewalks vary.
- Eclectic.
- Highly trafficked areas need cement not brick sidewalks. Village streets in-between are charming, but often dangerous in brick!
- Why not? Forced uniformity seems way too cutesy in an area with a variety of house styles, and a variety of streetscapes, if this were a planned community w/ uniform building materials & street widths, uniform-landscaping 2 might say something different.
- Diversity is good.
- The Village sidewalks have evolved overtime-there is no reason to have the kind of uniformity one sees; planned communities.
- Too meet the local appearance.
- Part of Village charm-no need to charge us \$ to change this.
- This is still a Village
- The materials should reflect the characteristics of the preferred street.
- Variety not a problem
- This seems the least important of any question asked so far. Does someone really care?
- To maintain brick walks in some areas.
- Bricks aren't needed everywhere. Concrete is easier to maintain.
- Because the old brick walks are charming and should be maintained, but may be too expensive to use throughout the Village.
- More interesting visual effect
- Part of the Village charm.
- Leave well enough alone. Reduce disruptions.
- Expense; I think only need brick in certain historic areas.
- Variety is more attractive.
- For variety. Village should not look like a pre-planned community.
- As is, is fine.
- Be consistent w/current use.
- Variable looks less like a subdivision--reflects character.
- Not uniform historically. Reflects character of community.
- I don't think this is a critical issue.
- No particular uniformity
- by consistent on same street. Creates interest and not a sterile feel.
- Depends on individual street. Variety adds charm to Village.

- Because they vary now and it is not important or valuable to tear them all up for the sake of uniformity
- Character
- Not worth expense of replacing.
- More pleasing & historically consistent.
- I like brick, but probably too expensive for whole Village.
- It has always been this way.
- Variation reflects the evolutionary development (?) of the Village.
- Do not care. Waste of resources to regulate.
- Save \$! Who cares?
- Does not seem to be a problem to have variations among areas -but probably need consistency within blocks.
- No need to redo sidewalks for appearance sake.
- Don't want to tear out existing.
- Don't do unnecessary work.
- But, only change to uniform when sidewalk needs replacement
- Not a big issue.
- Different surfaces e.g. Brick create more character.
- It's more natural
- I love the brick, but it's so slippery when wet that I walk in the street!!
- Can't see spending the money to re-do walks.
- Historically they have varied.
- Doesn't seem worth the expense for consistency.
- Variety is attractive
- Uniformity does not equal charm
- Doesn't make that big of a difference - although the brick pavers are nice.
- Easier to maintain sidewalks in present state than converting all to uniform materials.
Also, different materials are appropriate to different areas depending on volume of traffic.
Brick is great, but not as good for heavy use.
- This does not really matter. We do not have sidewalks. If you are thinking of the historic district it does matter.
- Cash, appearance
- Different materials fit the historical & non-historical
- The sidewalks are fine as they are. There is no problem walking on them.
- No need to re-do so they match
- I think sections of the neighborhood should have the option to upgrade to brick or slate
of they want what determine which blocks get concrete & which get bricks?
- An owner deserves to have some flexibility and creativity in designing outside surface.
- Variety is pleasant - We already live in a police state- this is very benign.
- More interesting
- Preserve what we have now
- I don't want brick - too hard to shovel
- Interesting.
- Not a problem

- More interesting
- Variety is more interesting creates more individual character.
- We are not new development. Time variation.
- Ok with me to have flags
- more interesting - the Village has eclectic architecture, no need for sidewalk "uniformity"
- not to look like a development
- Reflects neighborhood
- I like the Variety. I do not think the walkways need to be fixed-up!
- On many blocks of the Village the concrete sidewalks are appropriate and long lasting, in other areas, esp. historic, brick seems appropriate.
- I like brick sidewalks, but they may not be feasible in all situations - and may be expensive
- Variety is attractive.
- Can depend on the characteristics of the neighborhood
- Why should you change something that is working perfectly well?
- As long as they conform to standards of safety.
- Unnecessary expense to replace
- Allocate expenditures-Fairly! You have created another Taj Mahal with your new brick sidewalks by the Village Hall.
- Adds character to the homes & Village.
- Sidewalks that are replaced should be replaced with the same material in use before replacement.
- Part of the charm of the Village is the variety of public sidewalks.
- All brick would be lovely but may not be affordable.
- Depends on traffic/usage. Brick walkway in buffer zone is very nice.
- Let the Village be diverse place!
- Because they already do
- Already vary. Areas are different.
- Contributes to character of Village
- Let some variation.
- Leave well enough alone.
- I disagree with proposal to have brick sidewalks on all street in the Village
- Brick sidewalks have been a problem in the Village as they age. Roots of trees buckle them and make them ugly - See house at Oliver and Cedar Parkway.
- Part of Village charm. More important, retrofit is difficult - if same as County standards - concrete, 6' wide, 2 sides of street - will lose trees and have look of new subdivision.
- Not worth the cost of changing
- Do not see need for consistency
- I don't think the expense of changing over to one throughout is merited.
- What the sidewalk materials are now work well with the neighborhood.
- We should not be looking for a Stepford Village here.
- Although it might be aesthetically nice to have all brick sidewalks, it would not appear sufficient to justify incurring the high costs to taxpayers.
- Don't make the Village look like a developer's jewel.
- It would be difficult to replace existing sidewalk

- Concrete walks are preferable, but consistent with existing and continuous blocks if desired by residents.
- Not important
- It is lovely to walk the Village and appreciate that it is a community developed/changing overtime.
- More attractive, more design options.

Question 21

In general, should the Village construct more sidewalks where they are currently not present?

Comments for Survey Response: Yes

- Brookville Road
- West area-Kirkside Drive.
- When we purchased I believe sidewalks a necessity. Kirkside?
- Safety. Brookville Road
- Especially on Brookville Road!!!! Brookville Road ASAP.
- walking on sidewalks is healthy and friendly. Where? Between Grafton and Hesketh on Wisconsin Avenue. Even, perhaps, to Bradley Lane. Also, Brookville Road should be top priority.
- Safety, appearances.
- Sidewalks are great for meeting neighbors & safer for those who like to walk. Where? West Area.
- Certain areas have both high vehicle & high pedestrian use, along Brookville.
- Brookville Road!!!
- safety, many streets in west side including park street
- In some areas you need them
- Think Georgetown. Please focus on getting fuel and permits to make continuous sidewalks on both sides of Brookville: Children will be killed there!
- Kids, walkers, safety. Oliver Street
- Safety. Brookville Road.
- As long the residents on the block agree. We should affirmatively ask people if they was a sidewalk.
- Brookville Road, for example seems treacherous for pedestrians more so in winter & fall.
- Brookville Road
- Dangerous to force children to walk on street. Where? Kirkside.
- Street without sidewalks are unsafe. Walking should be encouraged for environmental & health Where? Brookville Road.
- Or require new construction to include sidewalks per specifications.
- Sidewalks contribute to a feeling of community.
- For the benefit of the pedestrian, where possible. Where? Primrose Street.
- 1-Safety, 2-handicap
- To encourage more walking and make it safer. Where? Kirkside.
- Safety on our street, people walk in the roadway. Where? Brookville Rd (first) then everywhere.

- Safety.
- Not needed. Where? Excellent, Brookville Road
- Safety. Where? Along Brookville Road
- Brookville Road.
- Safety of Children. Brookville is very dangerous in the morning & evening when children for to & from school.
- But not urgent as long as streets are relatively quiet.
- Safety for pedestrians. Newlands - Broad Branch & Brookville Rd.
- encourage pedestrian traffic and safety - Brookville Road
- Safety & convenience. Brookville Road, Summerfield Street, Broad Branch Road
- For children's and pedestrians' safety, and to encourage walking over driving to promote community and reduce traffic noise pollution and air pollution.
- Increasing traffic makes it dangerous to walk. Kirkside Drive; streets from Kirkside to Belmont/Buffer; East Village
- Safety-esp. for children. Where? Brookville & Broad Branch.
- 1--Safety, 2--Handicap
- Many people in the Village walk--
- Safety.
- Possibly along Brookville Road
- Kirkside, between Grafton Street and Western Avenue
- Brookville Road
- Dangerous on Brookville. Where? Brookville Road.
- In areas where traffic creates danger. BROOKVILLE ROAD!!
- Safety for children and pedestrians ~ Brookville Road
- Only with concurrence of residents on the street.
- Safety; children's play; encourage & spread walking in Village
- Along Kirkside Drive.
- Dangerous! And sidewalks & make the are seem friendlier. Brookville Road & Grove Street
- Quality of foot traffic to shop/metro/path - people walk in middle of street. Dead end blocks of west section. Center Street - lots of children. Please install.
- Go to streets with no sidewalks.
- Sidewalks encourage walking & neighborliness. Kirkside
- We have more parents with small children ~ wherever feasible.
- Brookville Road & Wisconsin Avenue (Grafton to Hesketh)
- Safety concerns, from Primrose to Western- at least on one side.
- Safer, more pleasant for walking & driving. Where? Where possible, at least one side.
- Pedestrian safety and convenience. Where? Anywhere there are none now.
- We have children & w/out sidewalks it's scary to be out for walks. here? Esp. Brookville Rd but even on other streets e.g. no sidewalk on the way to the bus stop at Primrose & Oxford St-big pain in the morning!
- Better pedestrian accessibility.
- Many residents who walk or jog are endangered by other their absence. Where? At least on one side of all roads.
- Allows for more walking and better safety. Where? Brookville Road

- Safety/Brookville Road
- mixed feelings, we are currently involved in Brookville sidewalk committee with direct impact on us.
- If neighbors agree & want. Yes, if need safe walkways.
- Only where safety is an issue. Brookville Road.
- Brookville Road for Safety. There may be other areas. If not a safety issue, and not having a sidewalk would not be an issue- I think lavish requirements to have sidewalks would nip away at Village casual charm.
- Definitely-safety precautions against increasing traffic; Brookville Road
- Safety; handicapped access. Brookville Road from Western Ave. North
- Makes the neighborhood. Where? Where residents desire.
- Safety of pedestrians and clear way for cars. Where? West Side.
- Currently presence of sidewalks is uneven due to the lack of enforcement by CCV in the past. Through out CCV.
- If possible, sidewalks make a neighborhood. (safety, too) I'm afraid sidewalks might impose on current small front yards in areas w/o sidewalks.
- Make Village more walk friendly on Brookville Road!!
- One of the charms of the Village is that is a lovely neighborhood to walk-in sidewalks would facilitate this.
- Public Safety; Brookville Road
- For ease of walking, instead of in the street, where there are none like Grove Street, Center etc.
- On Brookville Road
- Pedestrian Friendly, only with consent/approval of adjacent resident
- Safety, wherever we don't have any
- But , not essential if having need for other things (my street has sidewalk - I walk from metro - often in street
- If designed correctly, sidewalks keep people and children safe.
- Dangerous for Children - Brookville Road near Western.
- Safety for walkers - East side of Broad Branch Road
- So we can walk on it - Brookville Road
- Along Brookville Drive from E. Kirke (?) - to wherever 1 sidewalk begins en route to Brookville Market.
- Hard to walk in streets w/o sidewalks
- Along Brookville Road - both sides of street
- To let small children mingle with neighbors and to give old people safer places to walk. Everywhere.
- Brookville Road
- Brookville Road - Safety reason - Brookville Road
- Dangerous for pedestrians - Brookville Road
- Safety/ That is an immediate must along Brookville Road
- I like to walk. Walking on Brookville & Wisconsin Ave. (Hesketh to Grafton) and dangerous. Brookville Road Wisconsin Avenue between Hesketh & Grafton.

- Health of public requires walking - most resident of the Village are near enough some commercial area to make it possible to walk for milk or to get an ice cream cone and this should be encouraged.
- I think every block should have a sidewalk - Safety for people walking; encouraging walking, neighborhood feeling
- Where they are needed
- Either walk on the street or a sidewalk
- Particular need on Brookville Road
- Safety on walk to metro (Montgomery Street)
- In a few locations such as Brookville Road where safety is an issue.
- because it adds to the neighborhood atmosphere and add to safety. East Village, Summerfield road has sidewalks on some parts of the street & none in others parts Broad Branch & Primrose also could benefit from sidewalks
- Where safety - particularly for children is an issue- Brookville Road
- Sidewalks are great community assets - not only for safety, but symbolic of community use of private space. Where space allows...
- Safety and convenience. Where? Where there is pedestrian traffic.
- Along Brookville Road
- Areas - no sidewalks force pedestrian to use the street.
- Please build one on-On Brookville Road. Connecticut Ave. is dirty & heavy traffic therefore dangerous for children & dogs.
- Safety/community/ability of children to walk places. Kirkside Drive from Western to Oliver
- If residents want. Brookville -dangerous.
- For pedestrian safety. Grove Street.
- As someone who walks his dog in the Village, I appreciate being able to walk on a sidewalk wherever possible. Where? On at least one side of a street/block that has no sidewalk.
- It is unsafe to walk in the street-especially Kirkside . In fact at night it is outright dangerous. Where? Kirkside.
- Oh Brookville Road for safety--safety should be a paramount concern. Brookville Rd- but not on every block w/o a sidewalk. Only where safety an issue.
- Unanswerable, It depends on too many variable conditions: i.e. front prop.line/st/width
- Safety and more uniform presentation. Upgrade existing walks - Brookville if possible.
- Brookville Road
- If no tree or good landscaping are destroyed
- It's a safety issue
- If possible within reason of homeowners rights. We all walk a lot along the streets where cars park in the street.
- But only on as needed basis such as for safety. As needed for safety.
- Brookville Road
- Consistency - Complete sidewalks on Primrose Street
- There are many streets in the Village that are dangerous because pedestrians have to walk in the streets - Anywhere where pedestrians have to share the road with vehicles.
- Where feasible - I have children and don't want them walking in street. Too much space is given to cars.

- Feasible
- If the neighbors want them yes, if not then don't encourage walkways. Is important though takes people out of their cars. Brookville Rd would be nice to have a sidewalk.
- This is a pedestrian friendly town.
- Traffic has increased. sidewalks should exist throughout the Village. One example - Kirkside St. needs sidewalks.
- Disability access/safety, pedestrian safety, safety for children or scooters or bikes. Wherever they do not exist.
- Brookville Road
- We need cross walks at Connecticut Ave. Brookville Road.
- Safety. West section-numerous areas, but especially on main roads e.g. Kirkside Dr.

Comments for Survey Response: No

- Leave it up the resident a particular street & those resident should pay for it
- The present configuration supplies.
- Has a need been shown? If so, let us in on it.
- They destroy old trees, the pride of the Village. Where? No more sidewalks wherever there are trees.
- Not always necessary-spoils existing?(Unable to decipher rest of sentence).
- No need to do this.
- Cost-existing sidewalks are fine in my area.
- I think it would be difficult given present locations of trees and landscaping or areas where there are no sidewalks.
- We do not need them
- If really needed, they would exist now
- Like the rural aspect. Brookville Road
- Takes away green space
- It gives a neighborly feeling to meet in street.
- "IN GENRAL" sidewalks are fine. If there is a specific need, address it as appropriate.
- mixed feelings, we are currently involved in Brookville sidewalk committee with direct impact on us.
- If neighbors agree & want. Yes, if need safe walkways.
- If they were really needed they would have been done long ago.
- Lack of necessity
- Make it more pedestrian friendly. Make kid safety.
- Right of ways are planted with mature trees in many areas in West area. You omit need to cut down all the trees to away all the green space to is this.
- Not Necessary - not enough traffic except Conn., Brookville & Bradley
- The sidewalks are fine as they are. There is no problem walking on them.
- These contribute more hard surfaces for run-off we home as such grand negotiation as possible in the right of way.
- We purchase our home on a street without sidewalks. We don't want our small front yard co-opted for a sidewalk.

- Unnecessary.
- Streets are quiet & useable by pedestrians
- Unless you can use antique (old) brick to match original
- Let's not overlook most street home walks on one side at least
- Unless there is a danger as on Brookville Road
- I like the country look of not sidewalk on both sides everywhere.
- Doesn't appear to be necessary expense.
- Unfair to existing homeowners who have grass there.
- Have Plenty
- New sidewalks should only be considered if property owners agree or request it. There are already many fine sidewalks. Don't take any land away from the front yard of owners homes.
- Would disturb character of existing neighborhood
- Adequate at present
- Will impact trees & waste money--other issues are more important such as underground utilities. Where? Absolutely no need for sidewalks on both sides of a street.
- Unless required for safety.
- Not needed. Extra expense.
- Not necessary.
- Unanswerable, It depends on too many variable conditions: i.e. front prop.line/st/width
- Depends on how busy the street is. If needed for pedestrian safety.
- Too expensive. They should only be placed where needed for pedestrian safety.
- Must be important need - go street by street - only one side. Retrofitting all street with sidewalks will cause problems stated above. Sidewalk is needed on Brookville Road. Need compatible materials narrower widths, go around trees, only on one side. Takoma Park has worked on this.
- Costs would outweigh benefits
- With the exception of building a sidewalk on Brookeville Rd, there doesn't appear to be a need for constructing additional sidewalks in the Village.
- Unless all residents on the block favorite. And it would need to be wider!
- Not necessary as can walk on side streets.
- I have not found their absences an inconvenience. Some people walk on the road even when sidewalks are present.
- Not needed.

Question 22

Within the lot, should a paved walkway adjacent to a driveway be separated by landscaping in order to minimize the perceived amount of paving?

Comment for Survey Response: Yes

- Otherwise it will look like a giant driveway.
- It looks better & reduces the concentration of paved areas.
- Featuring landscaping is too intrusive

- For the reason given.
- It looks better.
- In order to minimize.
- More greenspace
- Only if property exceeds allotted amount of hard surface.
- Appearance
- Depends on situation of course. Water could fall on landscaping.
- Use guidelines for this question. There are too many variations to regulate.
- Of course landscaping is very important.
- More visually pleasing.
- Looks nicer-but not a huge problem.
- Many residents who walk or jog are endangered by other their absence. Where? At least on one side of all roads.
- More green is always better.
- Depends on design.
- Not a bad idea- but this is getting really detailed.
- If possible, make a nicer approval. Not sure if this should be required tho.
- Looks better
- Attractiveness
- Yes, but why should this be required.
- I haven't seen a problem with this
- It would be more aesthetically pleasing
- Very Good Idea.
- Oxygen green is good
- Prefer open front yards with lawn as opposed to hedges or fences.
- To preserve as much green as possible
- Looks better.
- To retain the character of the neighborhood.
- Enhance compatibility
- Unclear question. Have a rule giving maximum paved width, anyone with less width could automatically add a walkway.
- I would allow appeals--some areas don't allow space
- Unanswerable. Too many design variables-(creativity!)
- Who decides what enough is? Some people like sunny yards so that flowers can grow.
- Again, this take discution, really depends on location & context. Village needs a design architect as a consultant.
- It would be nice.
- More greenery, the better too many people would pave large portions of front yard if allowed.
- Better aesthetically

Comments for Survey Response: No

- Not necessary, too restrictive & subjective

- Silly.
- Varies
- don't perceive the need.
- Depends on the set-up
- Over regulation.
- Depends too much on application so many relatively small lots would appear cut-up by tiny landscaping areas & these would accomplish little in this application . In a larger setting, similarly, a small walkway adjacent or nearly so (separated by a tiny landscaping area) seems equivalent to me, a walkway of X dimension in either case. If the issue is the walkway, why not require people to walk in the driveway, thus elementary need for an additional paved surface.
- Too nitpicking.
- Not necessary.
- Again, the point is to limit actual paving i.e., impervious coverage limits do the trick.
- Not necessary
- Too intrusive regulation.
- This can be taken care of an impervious area limit, leaving the aesthetic to the homeowner.
- Lot sizes vary & walkways near driveways may not have room for landscaping.
- Not necessary
- Only Western dictated by overall design.
- Not needed.
- They are ok as they are on over
- This is sheer busy bodiness
- Homeowner's decision
- I would think that limiting the amount of paved area over all should be more important than whether or not there are 2 kinds of paving.
- Driveways (single) are not wide enough to exit an SUV & not step on proposed landscaping.
- Unnecessary restriction on aesthetics.
- Item 14 should cover it.
- Not important
- Lot variations (topography, etc.) will make a uniform standard unreasonable in certain circumstances.
- Do not care. Waste of resources to regulate.
- Depends on design.
- Over-regulation!!!
- Owners discretion
- I'm not in favor of overregulation as opposed to using common sense.
- Individual homeowner decision.
- This is not a hot issue with me compound to all the others.
- too picky
- No need to add more landscaping to the Village "streets"
- I think this should be optional subject & voluntary guidelines.

- Too Much regulation
- Too much trouble for homeowner
- Too petty and intrusive
- Unnecessary
- Not a problem
- Not a financial priority
- Subjective
- Micromanagement unnecessary
- too picky
- Ridiculous
- Up to the owner
- Our front lots are narrow enough. To place a strip of grass would further narrow front yards.
- Depends on width of driveway-narrow driveways could use paved walkways for entrance & egress of cars
- Should not be required
- This is an obvious preference of a property owner. Do not dictate how property owners can landscape or finish, locate their own walkways!
- This would be a design regulation and inappropriate
- Too intrusive make it voluntary.
- Decide on case by case.
- Too nit-picking
- Doesn't seem to happen very often. When it does, there's probably a reason.
- As a suggestion-but not a required rule
- Not your job.
- This is way too "down -in-the-weeds" and micromanaging.
- Unclear question. Have a rule giving maximum paved width, anyone with less width could automatically add a walkway.
- Unanswerable. Too many design variables-(creativity!)
- I like the design where by the walkways is attached to the driveway - appears less bulky than having them separate.
- Requirement would constitute over-regulation of private property rights.
- Let the homeowner make the decision.
- Too many rules already
- Again one man's "visual impact" is another woman's Picasso.
- The issue is related to lot coverage of impervious surfaces – both for physical (run off) and aesthetic reasons. Specifically mandating landscaping between the driveway and walkway does not address the problem. Urging more green and more trees in front and throughout the lot should be our concern.
- Leave people's front yards alone.
- Too much improvement if Village to require this.
- Will not make a big difference.
- Might limit comfortable access
- Too minor
- This is just silly! Strip vegetation is banal and dies. Why would the Village dictate this design?

- Should be suggested as design option.

Question 23

Currently, Village regulations require a replacement tree be planted only when a healthy tree is removed under the terms of a special permit. One option to preserve community character is to require that new canopy trees be planted when new construction occurs if the lot currently does not have enough trees and if appropriate space is available.

Comments for Survey Response: Yes

- Yes, but this should not substitute for regulations on lot coverage or FAR.
- Need trees!
- We need trees! Tree provide shade, home to animals & help remove carbon dioxide from the air.
- Global warning
- More trees please!!
- These are a valuable resource.
- Character. Shade in summer. Water management. Based on a little informal study of my own; we are 5 degrees cooler than Wisconsin Ave. at Porter in the summer. It's the trees!!
- The canopies add to the desirable character of our Village. (to say nothing of giving home to insects, birds and other creatures which make our near-urban setting less city-like.
- but with flexibility
- It is an environmentally sound policy.
- Also, replace the scrub trees to minimize visual disruption.
- We like trees.
- Trees are good.
- Tree canopy is the simple most important feature of the Village.
- Yes, new houses appeared on bare land.
- Trees are a part of the Village.
- Canopy trees held distinguish this neighborhood.
- Trees are the soul of the Village.
- To preserve the character of the Village, promote privacy and reduce noise. Also to promote shade and foster wildlife habitats Environmentally sound and improves ambiance of neighborhood.
- Trees are essential to health & character of Village.
- It will be better for everyone.
- The more trees the better with one exception: Unsafe trees-e.g. walnuts that fall on people—should be removed when owners choose to do so.
- Trees are important to the community as a whole.
- More trees!
- We should enlarge the tree canopy.
- Tree are essential to preservation of the Village character.
- Good for environment, privacy and overall look as long as it makes sense with utilities. What about bury utilities?

- Canopy trees are one of the best things about the Village.
- So we can breathe
- Aren't we doing this already?
- In keeping with original intent of the landscape design of the Village.
- Can't have too many trees.
- The tree canopy is what makes CCV unique.
- This is a very important part of the Village.
- Contributes to Village's attractiveness.
- To preserve the unique quality of the neighborhood.
- More green is always better.
- What is enough? I generally agree with. But residents must be able to replace trees if there's a safety issue not related to construction.
- Canopy define the Village.
- Trees very important to the character of the Village.
- Lovely green shade trees characterizes the Village.
- Yes--Either do away with existing OR
- Trees are important
- We could always use more trees/other plants-shrub, etc.
- Heat sink w/o trees.
- Can never have enough trees.
- Again, how little is "not enough" and how much space is "appropriate"?
- Reforestation should be required if any trees are deemed or if helpful to "soften" appearance of new construction
- We all benefit
- More trees look better.
- Because it seems that we are losing too many trees already to "special permits" to those trees planted as replacements are - not providing the same service that the mature tree did. Adding new construction removes natural vegetation, replacing it with built surfaces. By requiring green landscaping (inserting trees) around the new construction there is some compensation to nature
- I love trees, but this possible req. must be vary reasonable.
- Tree committee should address the type of tree they recommend - consult with builders about appropriate planting – tree recommendations seem a bit arbitrary-
- To help with run-off problems and to serve as screen between properties.
- We need trees
- When an old tree dies it should be replaced as well.
- We lost so many trees in the big storm in 2.20 years ago - our older trees will dwindle and we must replace.
- Trees make the Village what it is.
- I only plant trees and remove deed one I seem to be in the minority in the Village
- Not necessary
- The canopy of large deciduous trees is an important features of the Village and should be maintained

- Trees add immeasurably to the Village atmosphere. However, when trees interfere with telephone & electrical lined, pruning them affects their appearance. The choice of tree is, therefore important - not the existence of trees in general.
- Because it's a way of maintain the character of the Village
- Canopy trees are real asset to the neighborhood - create privacy, mask unsightly buildings and are good for the environment.
- The more trees, the better.
- Yes, if the Village pay's for it.
- But get rid of the cable & telephone wires front!
- More trees the better.
- Who's to determine whether a lot has enough trees.
- We work to keep tree coverage.
- Trees are a great feature of the Village and create screening.
- I think there are numerous benefits that come from having lots of trees in the community.
- No other way to preserve canopy
- This would help replace trees lost to storms & disease, and help restore the "leafy" character of the Village.
- The tree canopy is essential to CCV character
- But what is "enough" some people want the sunlight others do not.
- Village, through much new construction and natural attraction is losing tree canopy.
- With care at: One option: If property owner does not have room, underwrites a large specimen tree in the block.
- If no room on property owner should be required to pay for large now tree on the block.
- More trees is always good.
- Green and the tall leafy coverage is a great asset.
- The more trees the better.
- Tree canopy benefits everyone.
- Tree canopy is a major positive feature of the Village.
- he Village trees are an essential part of Village quality.
- Keeps good arbor cover

Comments for Survey Response: No

- Replacement trees of my abutting neighbor were put on border with my property line & will now provide shade over my garden which has had full sun for 30 years I have been owner. Trees will grow over my property line & have potential of interfering with power lines
- What number is enough? Who determines? Village tree policy is a joke.
- There is a limit to what we should require.
- Only Voluntary.
- It should be the type of tree the owner wants and is proper for the house
- How many trees are "enough"? Who decides? 2. No consideration has been given to the effect of property trimming trees. Also, the "canopy" is morunitorm throughout the Village - is the intent to make it uniform? Why?
- Only Voluntary.

- We're in pretty good shape on trees.
- West Village has too many trees & it is hard to have beautiful gardens there.
- I do not think residents should be required to plant trees where none previously existed.
- Not everyone wants as many as the crazy tree committee.
- If a tree is too close to the home & the larger tree roots set into the basement can cause plumbing problems.
- Too much regulation
- Who will judge what is "enough"
- We had a bad experience with the tree committee.
- This is a misleading question designed to manipulate a response.
- Enough with the tree NAZIS!!! Current regs are adequate.
- Do not intrude on private initiatives in this manner.
- Unnecessarily restrictive, but it's a nice idea.
- In general, the Village has plenty of trees and most owners will plant them if it is appropriate.
- Do not care. Waste of resources to regulate.
- Too hard to decided what's appropriate.
- No--if possible to define "enough"....probably makes more sense than enforcing replacement of "weak tree" removals where there might be no space.
- What is enough?
- Love trees & esp. trees in neighborhood, but that kind of regulation is too much!
- Village is tree crazy-trees don't make the Village. People should have the right to do what they want on their property.
- I love our trees, but we need to reduce rather than increase the number-modesty.
- Too intrusive
- Too many other issues come into play with required tree planting e.g. Sunlight for other plants etc.
- We spend far too much time on this issue. It not really retorted to building code, FAR and mass/scale. Entire meetings are taken up on this.
- If land is used for new construction - there may not be space to plant a tree. Do not want to be "required" to plant a tree
- Tree committee should address the type of tree they recommend - consult with builders about appropriate planting – tree recommendations seem a bit arbitrary-
- But, what do you mean by "enough" trees?
- *I still mourn the elms I lost to the wind sheer storm but taking down 3 Leyland's (that had gone up for a screen) and replacing them with three other trees would have been inappropriate because of my neighbor's overplanting* Note when their Bartlett pears die (or are blown apart) then we're revisit the tree planting issue. Really not part of an mansionization issue unless excessive lot coverage removes all chance of tree plantings.
- Again, too intrusive. However, the Village could encourage tree planting by making trees available perhaps for free.
- Not a problem
- Too many regulations
- Encourage this - do not mandate

- Uniformity of landscaping is not desirable there is great individuality in the Village adding to its charm.
- There are already plenty of trees providing a canopy in the Village. Owners should not be required to plant trees in their rear yards. If trees do not already exist, an owner should not be required to plant them on their property.
- As someone with a large canopy tree in my backyard, I can say that it's a choice not everyone would want to make. Has huge impact on what else can be planted, esp. in terms of shade. Not everyone wants to be limited to ferns and hosta in their backyard! Some people want sun.
- Not your job to tell homeowner how to landscape their own property.
- Too many rules, but could suggest adding a replacement tree.
- We have a well working tree canopy!
- Who decides what's enough? Some people like sunny yards so that flowers can grow.
- Don't see how this could be fairly enforced.
- This may to demanding on the property owner. Again this leaves has much discretion in the hands of the party that will decide what is "enough" trees. Too subjective.
- Who determines if the lot "currently does not have enough trees" Standard is too vague. Planting trees in public spaces/right of way should continue as usual.
- The area has a consistently dark appearance.
- If people are allowed to put in or remove trees as they wish then the Village will end up with exactly the right amount of trees. If the Village is going to insist on mandatory restrictions on Arboreal decisions then they should bear there full cost.
- Although deciduous canopy trees are crucial to the appearance of the Village and to reducing our use of energy for air conditioning, we do not support a regulation that is not clearly defined e.g. "if the lot does not have enough trees". We would urge the Village to encourage more planting of deciduous canopy trees by offering advice on selection, good prices on new trees, and perhaps assistance in planting (through Village-initiated arrangements with local nurseries and even perhaps subsidies).
- Who decides if a lot has "enough" trees? Also Village should enforce existing rules re sidewalk-requiring homeowners to cut scrubs, etc.
- Maybe they prefer roses.
- The present rule is intrusive enough and should maintain enough trees.
- Landscape issues are personnel
- Emphatically not! Who determines "not enough"?? For those of us who like to garden the Village in some places has too many trees on private property.

***Alternative Infill - Model A [35% Lot Coverage; Floor Area of 6,965 square feet
MODEL A: 2.5 story infill.***

Model A: Overall Comments

- Hadn't really thought about a lot of this, but things should fit in from front view & continue in rear however, but again hate to be too restrictive, but when looking at new construction, many just don't fit.
- Just too big.
- Look like a barn!

- While your massing may be correct- no architect would design a block of space like this - I believe that this is tossed in this survey to solicit "negative" responses
- Uninspiring fortress like design and much too big
- Cannot read drawings well, but all new constructions looks too big.
- In all of the above, it's just too much!! Does not blend well with the style of neighborhood.
- Residents must be allowed to use as much lot coverage as is their formal legal right
- Eclectic.
- Ugly boxes! I hate this but I believe its exactly where we are going. (See back of survey for more comments!)
- Big Box looming over neighbors.
- See houses 2 & 3 doors down & across.
- Architectural elements would need to be considered.
- Coherence is pleasing.
- If someone wants a really large house in the Village, I think they should be allowed to cover somewhat more of the lot rather than build a home with too much mass, out of scale & too much height.
- Too out of proportion.
- Only regulate the very very extreme.
- Looks to be more than 35% lot coverage--you'd have to show #'s to convince me.
- This should be prohibited by mandatory regulation.
- It dominates the block.
- Acceptable permit
- SUV syndrome; nearly 7,000 square feet would HUGE
- Too massive.
- Should be left to the experts and the regs be appropriating?? (Undecipherable.)
- Reaction to these models A-D is difficult to explain but somewhat intuitive.
- Not only is the proposed infill much larger than the surrounding houses it is
- completely uninteresting w/no-varying heights as the surrounding houses have.
- This is precisely what the Village should strive to prevent.
- One such structure is bad enough. With neighboring houses it also established precedent for duplication which would eventually be disastrous for the Village.
- While the hulking nature of the building is not compatible with its neighbors from an architectural and aesthetic perspective, I would not restrict further the owner's right to build this ugly house, other than by adding the limits used above in response to Questions 14,16, 18 & 23.
- You're not shopping apples & apples. Gray is one mass brown - stepped down multiples
- Illustrated structure vs. gross. With no redeeming features.
- Tell the owner to move to Avenel
- These next few pages are too manipulative. I would be generally fine with any of these proposals.
- I think this is ugly, but if that is what an owner wants, I think it should be allowed. Given it fits the current regs.
- Some simple changes could make this house much less of an eye sore.

- Just too big in comparison with neighbors. See item 6. That's why my answer on #6 is necessary.
- The design does not reflect the design of neighboring properties. Front projects beyond others
- affecting streetscape. Not compatible with existing houses.
- The abutting property has about the same lot coverage but seems so much more appropriate.
- Stop this.
- The design is rather ugly, like a barn, but it does not overshadow neighboring houses.
- A disaster
- This is clearly drawn in most unappealing light--there might be design/material that would work.
- Compatibility should not be the standard. Would you build a slum house in a slum neighborhood because it is compatible? Do what needs to be done to improve the area.
- It's ugly- It's too bad when Wal-Mart homes like this are built here or in other communities-I still don't understand how the Grove Street homes got to be so big & tall - with garages by enough for an apartment
- Clearly larger. But question is do I care?
- It seems our neighborhood need to be able to change with the limits in place. Otherwise, all values will be negatively impacted over time.
- My comments on all of these figures: houses prior to 1950 should be demolished.
- Too big. Does not fit in any respect.
- Rear height side setback & overall mass cause problem FAR standards would help.
- The design of a new home should be left to the owner / architect - within Montgomery County regulations
- Design should be mere in keeping with the context of other homes in the blocks
- Out of all proportions with other houses.
- As you can notice from my responses, I am in favor of not encouraging Mc Mansion & overbuilding in the neighborhood small is beautiful.
- Too much lot coverage; too great a mass & form does not look compatible with existing.
- "Out of Balance" - not neighborly its like walking into a classic gallery and seeing a jarring red & orange neon sign where "peace" was in place.
- Let us be what we are. We don't have to compete with Loudoun County.
- Mass should be broken up with varying wall heights, porches & etc.
- The additions that I dislike the most are because of their mass & scale relative to neighbors, the architectural style & material is not consistent with the existing house.
- Either 'step down' or 'wall length' or 'wall height' changes would improve the fit or compatibility of this structure.
- Too many regulations! This is not a communist country!!
- None of these models is an egregious as the new house at the Wisconsin Ave. end of Hesketh Street
- Again if you are the immediate neighbor, your garden now looks at it's a house an not a garden. How may eight person families live in the Village & need that space?
- None of these models is an egregious as the new back at center. While stone house and end of Hesketh takes up a lot of the lot - its design is less out of place.

- 35% is too high for the Village.
- Maintain the historic feel
- This certainly looks like far more than 35% lot coverage.
- Models continue to be misleading. They mislead because of their boxed design and---- use of alternative color to make them more pronounced. Houses would not be designed this way for the Village--HPC would never allow it.
- Eventually neighborhood would appear more crowded as more Model A's spring up. If hard times come bare houses might be subdivided.
- Be as restrictive as legally possible.
- This is to be a living neighborhood w/room to see play & enjoy the community.
- Too big and monolithic a structure. Clever use of style might it compatible.
- This looks like a warehouse in a neighborhood. Ruins the balance & proportions of the neighborhood & overwhelms existing homes & blocks the sense of open green space & sunlight.
- Overall height of building would probably be acceptable if side walls weren't so enormous. This is why it needs more one-story elements on the sides. More variation in pitch/gable orientation.
- This is just a big box and doesn't reflect existing architecture.
- I think the Village was the first planned suburb in the U.S. Let's keep it that way--don't destroy it.
- Should depend on whole area, not just block. Perhaps one rule for all of west area, etc. 35% coverage is too large, but block shape better preserves backyard privacy than model B. Treats houses on both sides equally.
- Residents complain about adverse impact on property values. I think that property values will fall if we do not take action to prevent enormous ugly houses in CCV.
- Control of bulk will accomplish this on any lot of any size!
- Really would not want to live near house shown much too large for lot.
- Everything is wrong, but if the pointed box were exactly the same except smaller & not as tall, it would be ok. Would a FAR to fit Model D work? We think so. Also new height standard.
- Too big for our block + lot sizes
- Looks like large warehouse
- With plantings this building can fit in. It is also unlikely that you get a home with only roofline. Would like to see some relief.
- This is a very poor way of depicting this situation. The adjacent properties have different architectural elements that break the property down. The infill is directed on one large mass not a very fair way of presenting their situation.
- Aesthetically it does not look that great to me but my desires for a property I do not own should not outweigh those of the actual owner.
- All of these pictures are hideous construction like this would ruin the character of CCV.
- Most of the models shown, particularly in A & B, appear to cover more of the lot, to be larger in mass & scale, and to be different in building form than the neighboring houses. However, the concept of "compatibility" implies static. Our neighborhood, which is partly in and partly outside the historic district, looks very different in 2007 than when we moved here in 1981. Given extensive renovation and some new construction, those

houses as they exist today would not have been considered “compatible” with the nearby houses in 1981. They are generally larger in mass and scale, often quite different in style (or building form) and cover more of the lot. “Compatibility” with what exists today will inhibit the dynamic evolution in the future that has been a hallmark of CCV for more than 100 years.

- I don't think it is wise for the Village to try to control these aspects. To subjective, given Bd members too much control, opens Village to litigation we all have to pay for.
- But still we should allow it if it takes up no more then 25% if yard & meets setback requirements. We can't preserve everything to what we have at present. The other house will evolve over time.
- Massive scale overpowers neighbors.
- Compatibility should not be such an important issue.
- It dominates neighboring homes.

Lot Coverage:

Comments for Survey Response: Compatible

- You cannot infringe upon legal rights of the resident
- Lots are vastly underused at 35% in any case.
- There is enough green space.
- Rear yard still adequate; side yards a little tight. 30% coverage would be better.
- Plenty of room front & back. Doesn't overwhelm neighbors.
- It's within 35' rule
- Some of the other houses spread out to cover similar area.
- 35% Lot coverage approved by county. House doesn't appear larger than some of the others.
- Open space
- The architecture can be worked out to be compatible
- Too Big

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- Can't tell if it exceeds 35%.
- With jogs/offsets & height step-downs the increase lot coverage would be more comparable.
- We are less concerned with lot coverage than with mass & scale.
- A bit big but so is the lot.
- Scale back.
- Covers too much land.
- It's bigger, but less obtrusive.
- Impacts neighbors to rear.
- Front lot is compatible.
- It's within 35' rule.
- Most new homes are larger than the original home.
- The larger space could be tolerated if the design was more compatible.

- Coverage ok but massing too big.
- looks too big, wide compared to neighboring house but not terrible.
- Seems to maintain decent size yard.
- Single mass of infill gives impression of less open lot space than existing houses with else or separate garages.
- This one is not compatible other structures.
- Not too drastic.
- Coverage wouldn't be as much of a problem if mass/scale form were appropriate.

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- Occupies more of lot than adjacent homes.
- Hard to believe this meets regs-appears huge to neighbors
- Too big.
- Does not fit, far too large, over powering.
- Too large.
- Out of scale with context.
- Lot coverage much greater than neighboring houses.
- Too uniform.
- Too big.
- Seems to double those surrounding
- Because back structure reduces neighbors privacy.
- Too big for the lot.
- Proposed is too big
- The house clearly is much bigger than all others.
- Too big a footprint for lot & neighborhood.
- Too large, compared to left and right neighbors
- Boxey- No Character
- Too Big
- Out of proportion, looks menacing and unattractive.
- Too bulky.
- Too large.
- Too massive.
- Overwhelming
- Covers too much
- Looks out of place
- Rear yard coverage out of scale
- Out of Kilter with rest.
- Ruins rear space of neighbor.
- Outsized diminished "look" of neighborhood.
- Takes up too much greenspace
- Too much mass, too small yard left
- Not in scale
- Looming takes up too much of the lot

- Too big for lot
- Too big
- Too large a footprint
- Too Big
- Too massive. Looks solid
- Visually – onerous
- Too much
- Block neighbors air & light
- Greater coverage than the largest house on the block
- Excessive Mass
- Overpowers
- Too Massive
- Too big.
- Almost double-the size of adj. Homes
- Too big & bulky for lot surrounding
- Too Big
- This mass dwarfs adjacent structure.
- Too large & boxy
- Too big relative to other houses
- Sticks out like a sore thumb
- Too big for the neighborhood
- Too high at peak and at walls
- Looks enormous.
- Takes up too much space
- Larger than seven houses shown.
- Looks like office building among single family homes
- Too big
- Too big.
- Not compatible, but so what!!
- It's a monstrosity
- Too large.
- Too big
- It dominates neighboring homes.
- Overwhelms site

Mass & Scale:

Comments for Survey Response: Compatible

- What is compatible? Set backs only requirement.
- There are plenty of large houses next to small ones.
- The architecture can be worked out to be compatible.

Comment For Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- Some diversity of design would help
- A bit "boxy" but the other homes are dated.
- Too much bulk along side & rear--need to break it up with better design.
- It's bigger, but less obtrusive.
- Go wait for other houses & he as gig!
- There are plenty of large houses next to small ones.
- Most new homes are larger that the original home
- All 2-story structure rather than multiple level
- Looks too big, wide compared to neighboring house but not terrible
- Volume as a foundation of height, length & width misleads.

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- Way too big
- Makes building sense to max. living space but big box dwarfs neighbors.
- Too big.
- Too Tall
- Massively in differentiated as well as taller, deeper & unrelenting by solid. UGLY
- Too large.
- It dwarfs nearby houses
- 2x size of neighboring houses
- Too uniform not enough space between buildings.
- Too big.
- It dwarfs other houses
- Dwarves existing
- Because height & ways neighboring structures.
- Towers over neighbors.
- Overwhelming others
- Too big compared with other house.
- Again too big
- Large box effect
- The height is much greater than the adjacent house.
- Incompatible with neighbors too big.
- Dwarfs other houses.
- Height
- Too High, Too Much
- Too Big
- Too big- dwarfs other houses.
- Out of proportion, looks menacing and unattractive.
- Side & rear elevations present a massive unbroken wall to neighbors.
- Too large.

- Overpowers the surrounding houses.
- No architectural differentiation makes it look huge.
- Overwhelming
- Too large
- Looks out of place
- Huge volume
- Too large & dense.
- Too Boxy
- Too large for neighborhood. Look out of place.
- Too massive
- too much mass, too small yard left
- Not in scale
- too blocky
- Too big for surrounding houses
- Too high & long
- Top one dimensional
- Too large and mass
- Too Big
- The other houses do not occupy 35% of the lot appear to
- It has got to have some scaled down levels to form some relationships with neighbors' homes
- Massive and ugly
- Too big
- Overwhelming
- Could fit two of the adjacent homes
- Excessive Mass
- Overpowers
- Looks much large
- Too Massive
- too solid and boxy
- Too big.
- Blocks sunlight for neighbor
- Look like a barn
- Roof & unbroken wall height
- No breaks in scale
- Again, it dwarfs adjacent structures
- Too boxy & large driveway seems too big, garage part of main structure.
- Too big
- Sticks out like a sore thumb
- Side, rear & street front are not compatible & other houses
- Obviously too big
- Looms over adjacent houses. Appears that FAR is higher than adjacent.
- Too high at peak and at walls
- Height of structure appears to exceed limits
- Overwhelms other houses

- Looks like a big barn
- Larger rectangular building
- So Massive
- Mass overwhelms & robs neighbors of privacy.
- Too big
- Too large & not in scale with surrounding homes.
- Too big.
- Not compatible, but so what!!
- Much too large for neighborhood.
- Too large.
- Too big
- Detail lacking.
- Overshadows adjacent sites.

Building Form:

Comments for Survey Response: Compatible

- Should not be a form requirement.
- People should have freedom on design.
- 2 1/2 story gabled - some form
- The architecture can be worked out to be compatible
- Same ship

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- Depends on where government is in the Village-greenhouses here are just plain boxes.
- A bit big but other houses have high front.
- a bit large but again the other homes are dated.
- Shape seems similar to surrounding buildings.
- Obviously, this architecture would not actually be built! Too monolithic.
- It's bigger, but less obtrusive.
- Oh, but uninteresting and too big.
- Style really isn't different just scale.
- Other than size does not seem out of symmetry with neighbor
- The new structures have rectangular sides & a sloping roof street façade is similar.
- not deeper than the "additions" on some of the neighboring houses
- Lacks characteristics of other structures so it is misleading.
- Sticks out like a sore thumb
- just too large
- I believe design issues are personal-I am just concerned when Lot/Mass/Scale imposes on another's space, but design issues are not important to me generally since I think it unfair to impose my designs on another.

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- Too boring of a design, too boxlike.
- Blocks air space views, shades, dwarfs existing homes
- Too big.
- Too Big/Tall
- Massively in differentiated as well as taller, deeper & unrelenting by solid. UGLY
- Too large.
- Unarticulated box.
- Too massive with no breaks.
- Too uniform.
- Too big.
- Too Bulky, square with no variation
- Overwhelming others
- Does not fit with other house forms.
- Too big
- Big box no architect features
- This house does not look like any other.
- Out of proportion
- starkly square
- Not interesting too massive, block light
- Looks like a warehouse one big block without temporizing angled- graduations
- Out of proportion, looks menacing and unattractive.
- All other houses have step-down additions.
- Too large.
- Too busy.
- Graceless & monolithic
- Destroys neighbors views, feeling and air movement.
- Looks out of place
- Boring form, massive and looming side walls
- Lack of any character
- Doesn't fit with existing homes.
- Not in scale
- Pitch of roof
- Too Big
- It has got to have some scaled down levels to form some relationships with neighbors' homes
- Obvious
- Too big
- Vaguely similar
- Looks like a box structure - articulation
- Excessive Mass
- Overpowers
- Each other house has sections additions

- It looks like a box, lacks the height variations of surrounding houses.
- Too Massive
- too boxy, monotonous in shape
- too solid and boxy
- Too big and massive.
- Look like a barn ...will they keep cow & chickens too?
- Box-like structure with no variation in roof line or wall heights
- it's shapeless. Only a moron would build such a form.
- Taller than other houses, scale out of place no appurtenant structures
- Does not fit in
- Not sure what compatible means in this context
- Too boxy
- Side, rear & street front are not compatible & other houses
- Too big.
- Not enough variation in lines. Needs more step-down elements to be compatible with adjacent structures.
- Too big
- Seems totally out of character; overwhelms structures on either side.
- building unappealing - box structure.
- Not aesthetically pleasing
- All other houses shown have one-story areas
- Just a big block.
- Box with pointed roof.
- Too Big
- Too big, for lot, even
- Too big.
- Not compatible, but so what!!
- Ugly
- Overwhelms other houses.
- Detail lacking.
- McMansion

Alternative Infill Model B - [35% Lot Coverage; Floor Area of 6,950 square feet]

MODEL B: L-shaped side gabled 2.5 story infill.

Model B: Overall

- Horrors!
- Looms over yard of neighbor to the right. Too close to side. Blocks light.
- Too much house for the space & the surrounding neighborhood.
- Out of scale & not consistent w/ character of neighborhood
- Still a monster!!
- It's all time limited and may (will) change if and when the new owners will decide to expand!

- Eclectic
- It is or its not compatible with regulation, Otherwise this question is one of taste. If you are asking if I'd accept this structure as a matter of taste I vote as above. See house 2 & 3 doors down & across back lot.
- This is an example of better land use especially if combined with proper storm water management.
- Too out of proportion.
- Only regulate the very very extreme.
- This should be prohibited by mandatory regulation.
- Acceptable permit
- Only works for neighbors on one side.
- Front elevation matching the neighbors'-overall makes for compatibility in mass (perceived) and form.
- SUV syndrome; nearly 7,000 square feet would HUGE
- Only regulate the very very extreme.
- A little better.
- Should be left to the experts and the regs be appropriating ?? (Undecipherable.)
- The size, height, lot coverage, mass & scale should not be substantially different than surrounding (adjacent) houses, regardless of zoning.
- This is where a rear-yard setback would be good because the house really cuts off lateral view and abuts the rear neighbors' yard.
- Shadows neighbors, reduce privacy.
- Again - Avenel would suit best
- Better that appearance of "A" model- but either are fine with us.
- Better than model A- but still see item 6.
- Side yard on one side is open but on the other side there is the undesirable tunnel.
- Too massive.
- This is better than model A, but just barely.
- Maybe ok.
- Despite its size it just about fits in with the style of the other houses.
- Too much coverage. Very displeasing from side view.
- Dwarfs other houses, better curb appeal.
- Rear would still adversely impact sense of "space" to rear neighbors.
- Too Big
- Compatibility should not be the standard. Would you build a slum house in a slum neighborhood because it is compatible?
- Do what needs to be done to improve the area.
- Owners should be allowed to have the size house they want as long as they can plan a compatible design that does not overpower their neighbors and fits well within the block.
- Better
- More thoughtfully designed. But do we want Village design rules. I don't.
- Takes up a lot of the lot but the form is comparable. The problem is that the height in the backyard would loom and make the neighbors yards feel closed in.
- Extension should be centered with halved in length.

- It seems our neighborhood need to be able to change with the limits in place. Otherwise, all values will be negatively impacted over time.
- So, if you limit what can be torn down, you have to give people the option to expand.
- Too big, too long, uses neighbor's open space.
- The design of a new home should be left to the owner / architect - within Montgomery County regulations
- It is not disproportionably large as view from the street
- Pity the neighbors one their side garden and backyard are dwarfed by this extension.
- Much too massive.
- "Out of Balance" - not neighborly its like walking into a classic gallery and seeing a jarring red & orange neon sign where "peace" was in place.
- This is a grotesque intrusion upon the open and airy vista of contiguous backyards.
- This resembles what our neighbors propose - 2 story structure on one side overview from neighboring side yards
- One needs to look at the neighbor's house. I believe that every renovation homeowner should contact each surrounding house, present plans, prior to approval & get an opinion letter
- Looks like too much lot coverage for the block, but side gables do help the scale & form parameters
- This would destroy the neighbor's privacy in the back, and seems to take up too much of the lot.
- Same problem. Diminution of value and enjoyment as neighbor looks on its walls and loses privacy.
- Somewhat compatible
- Maintain the historic feel
- Again this looks to be far more than 35% lot coverage.
- Not Compatible. Too big relative to other houses. Does not fit in.
- Eventually neighborhood would appear more crowded as more Model A's spring up. If hard times come bare houses might be subdivided.
- Better than Model A. More visual interest.
- This will block neighbor's sunlight cause water run off problems and all of the reasons previously listed.
- Design would be more appropriate if rear element were single-story, like house immediately behind it.
- Better than A, but do not feel the Village should dictate how to build houses.
- too big for the neighborhood
- Unfair to house on right. Need a rear yard setback rule. (Different for corner lots.) Should be no exceptions to 20' rear lot line--should require more than 20'.
- I think CCV should stick to 25% lot coverage--these are just too big.
- Control of bulk will accomplish this on any lot of any size!
- Would not want to live near house shown. House is too large from all perspective. Large two story structures in back is especially objectionable.
- Again, this would be OK if smaller and not as tall. Need height regulation and FAR for 25 % coverage.
- Horrible impact to one side property owner.
- One neighbors suffers disproportionately

- Appears to take up too much of the lot.
- This is a better way of depicting the building & other architectural elements can be used to break the mass down. Lot Coverage should be left up to the owner as long as they are built with the existing requirements
- Aesthetically it does not look that great to me but my desires for a property I do not own should not outweigh those of the actual owner.
- Pushing bulk to the back is in concept, a good idea, but this too big, with a huge negative impact on neighboring properties.
- Most of the models shown, particularly in A & B, appear to cover more of the lot, to be larger in mass & scale, and to be different in building form than the neighboring houses. However, the concept of “compatibility” implies static. Our neighborhood, which is partly in and partly outside the historic district, looks very different in 2007 than when we moved here in 1981. Given extensive renovation and some new construction, those houses as they exist today would not have been considered “compatible” with the nearby houses in 1981. They are generally larger in mass and scale, often quite different in style (or building form) and cover more of the lot. “Compatibility” with what exists today will inhibit the dynamic evolution in the future that has been a hallmark of CCV for more than 100 years.
- I don't think it is wise for the Village to try to control these aspects. Too subjective, given Bd members too much control, opens Village to litigation we all have to pay for.
- It dominates neighboring homes. As A, plus ruining the neighbors' backyard.

Lot Coverage:

Comments for Survey Responses: Compatible

- Appears compatible but model A is very misleading and unfairly presented.
- People take advantage
- Seems OK
- Mass & size broken down

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- Still huge but fits better with existing homes-roof lines, etc.
- Slightly better more to scale.
- Less bulky as viewed from street.
- Don't love how long the narrow side yard is.
- Rear setback a bit tight. 30% coverage probably would be better.
- Better; takes light
- A effort, but rear EL is too big
- Front lot is compatible
- Better than A, but not great!
- It's 35', so that compatible.
- Similar to A or B lots below,

- It appears to have proper front & side setbacks
- Front is compatible - side setbacks of 7' typical of Village.
- Infill house has more varied roof & wall height
- Still seems to take up more lot than neighbors
- This one is not compatible other structures.
- Too close to back wall.
- A little more attractive.
- Too long in rear

Comments for Survey: Not Compatible

- Occupies much more of lot than neighbors
- Exceeds 35%.
- horrible.
- Too large.
- Pity the poor people living behind.
- Blocks neighbors yard.
- Again, look at the % covered.
- Too big.
- View from rear yard blocked.
- Too large.
- Too large for lot size
- Extending so far back changes back views for neighbors; breaks visual line of yards across block.
- Look terrible.
- Too big & increases lot coverage compared to adjacent houses
- "McMansions"
- Again the house occupies really 25% more of its lot than adjacent homes
- Mass
- takes too much green space
- Worse than A.1
- So what.
- Still too large except for neighbors to rear, perhaps
- Right Side Yard - Too much coverage
- Slightly better more to scale.
- Extends too close to rear lot line.
- Looks like a lot more than 35% coverage
- Covers too much.
- Too small backyard taken up---comments neighbors light.
- Looks out of place
- Not too much coverage.
- Too much in rear.
- Uses up too much greenspace.
- Not in scale

- Still too big for lot
- Too big
- Too large of footprint
- Too Big
- rear portion of home extends too far in the backyard
- Too large
- Block neighbors views, air & light
- greater lot coverage - more massive then neighboring properties.
- Too close to line
- Covers much more area
- Too Massive
- Goes too deep
- Too Big
- It dwarfed the adjacent structures
- Rear element misaligned with adjacent. Ruins back-yard continuity. Loom over neighboring back yards.
- Too Large
- Whole back yard almost filled up
- Too large, albeit different shape.
- Too Big
- Too big
- Too big.
- Not compatible, but so what!!
- Facing street still too large a façade.
- No back yard.
- Too much

Mass & Scale:

Comments for Survey Response: Compatible

- Volume seems more compatible
- Mass & size broken down

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- Still huge but fits better with existing homes-roof lines, etc.
- Street perspective is better.
- Not so much larger that it looks like it doesn't be long.
- But back is close to not compatible.
- Appearances are better than previous examples
- Rear section would benefit by a step-down to 1 story near the back.
- Better; takes light
- Just feels larger than the other one. But better in front.

- A effort, but rear EL is to big
- View from street acceptable
- Similar to A & B
- This new construction still loom bigger that less disproportional relative and & some house on the block
- A little variation in levels help me tolerate it although the length in backyard is overbearing.
- Rear yard view looks much farther back than the neighbors house
- Looks very large for neighbors
- house is deeper than others on block but still has yard area
- Infill house has more varied roof & wall height
- At least there are breaks in the mass.
- Especially rear view.
- Wall too long
- Too big compared to neighbors
- Addition in rear long

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- Obstructs neighbors views
- Exceeds 35%.
- horrible.
- Long huge wall.
- better that A.
- Too large.
- Too big.
- Too close.
- Size dwarfs neighbors.
- Some looks good.
- Too Big.
- overwhelming to the lot
- Same as A.1
- Too much house for neighborhood
- the neighbors to the right would be significantly affected. Why should that be permitted?
- Dwarfs adjacent properties
- Dislike the very long wall.
- Rear yard side. Too large.
- Looks out of place
- Too big.
- Too massive
- Not in scale
- Too big
- Too Big
- Too deep into the lot

- Block neighbor views, air & light
- Too close to line
- Is much bigger
- Out of Scale
- Too big & too long
- Too massive
- It's still too big
- Side, rear & street front are not compatible & other houses
- FAR appears to be out of proportion to adjacent. Sidewall too large.
- Front wall too high/peak too high.
- Too big compared to neighbors
- Too Large
- Back part out of sink with neighbors
- All the mass boxes in street & neighbors on side rear.
- Too Big
- Too big
- Too big.
- Not compatible, but so what!!
- Too much house
- No green space.
- Too big
- Side yard & rear yard imposes on neighbors

Building Form:

Comments of Survey Response: Compatible

- No Standard.
- Matches others.
- just too large
- Could benefit by more façade relief.
- Other than sized seems in line with neighbors
- Too Large in mass side wall & setback all wrong
- Looks same in front has gables
- at least streetscape isn't bad
- Just because it is deeper, thus has more square feet of living space does not, make it incompatible there are houses like this Village now.
- Visually harmonious with other homes
- Characteristics appear similar to others
- OK
- Mass & size broken down

Comments for Survey Responses: Somewhat Compatible

- Still huge but fits better with existing homes-roof lines, etc.
- Attempts to break up volume.
- Better @ street side.
- Lot of tree coverage will be needed to protect neighbor.
- The enlarged space behind the front -so as noticeable
- Although two-story sides are overbearing.
- Shape is OK. Size & scale are not.
- A bit more interesting
- Better; takes light
- Lack of any character
- Lots of ugly homes within Village, which is ok.
- There is a little variations in levels
- better than model A
- More attractive
- Infill house has more varied roof & wall height
- It begins to have some shape
- Still seems taller than neighbors, rear seems boxy
- A slight improvement over "A", but two-story structure in rear is completely unlike any adjacent house.
- Too deep
- More attractive than A but still too big
- It's problem is size, not shape.

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- Needs step down or side adjacent to neighbors
- horrible.
- Long side wall, dominating yard too small
- ~ improvement over A. Still largely undifferentiated massive on building faces height better.
- Too large.
- Too big.
- Too large.
- Building destroys homogeneity of area.
- Disrupts neighborhood space.
- rear and side structures imposes on neighbors
- Still looks too much like a giant warehouse
- Looks out of place
- Front elevation is ok, but the EL is out of scale with the basic house and with other EL's.
- Not in scale
- Too overwhelming along side yard.
- Too Big
- Out of with other structures on the block.

- Block neighbor views, air & light
- Too close to line
- Side, rear & street front are not compatible & other houses
- Both side & rear construction appears to block in neighbor.
- No L-Shaped building shown
- Too big & walls are too long.
- Wall are too long
- Too big.
- Not compatible, but so what!!
- No charm
- Too large
- Side walls and rear addition wall very large

***Alternative Infill - Model C [33% Lot Coverage; Floor Area of 5,673 square feet]
MODEL C: L-shaped side gabled 2.5 story infill with staggered rear addition.***

Model C: Overall

- Obstructs neighbors' views of green space (closes in the neighbor's views)Obstructs neighbors' views of green space (closes in the neighbor's views)Obstructs neighbors' views of green space (closes in the neighbor's views)Obstructs neighbors' views of green space (closes in the neighbor's views)
- From street roof lines match-goes through to fill in most of rear but fits better with street-not sure that reduction of floor area matters.
- No
- Too much house to lawn.
- Isn't so close to either neighbor? Won't block as much sunlight.
- Better than the longer 35%, but really still too big.
- Eclectic.
- Buildings should not hem in neighbors' yards and create tunnel effects.
- Less glaring difference.
- Only regulate the very very extreme.
- This should be prohibited by mandatory regulations.
- Too large.
- Permit
- But still a large mass
- What will the homeowner do with the remaining 67%
- Maybe floor area should be limited this option suggest that would help.
- Only regulate the very very extreme.
- In all instances the result is ludicrous.
- A little better.
- Should be left to the experts and the regs be appropriating?? (Undecipherable.)
- Better but still too large compared to adjacent houses.

- Too big again
- The difference of FAR of 292 sq ft seems to make this more desirable. Changing the lot coverage also lessens the impact.
- Too massive.
- Seems like a good middle ground-Model D clearly nicer, but this is so so much better than A or B would probably suggest 30% plus a floor area restriction.
- This is fine.
- Broadly speaking it fits in with the other houses & gardens.
- Too Dig
- I have no objection to various large additions and one new home on W.Lenox Street. But lower Hesketh has a new home that is way out of scale with its neighbors.
- Fine by me if want to sacrifice backyard.
- But with height reduced, could be acceptable
- Still takes up more of the lot but isn't that jarring a difference- Neighbors yards less affected.
- Is better but not right yet!!
- Most important criteria, I think is controlling the design of what gets built and not worry
- This is still way too large in respect to the rest of the bldgs in the area.
- Not out of proportion with neighboring houses besides aesthetics being out of place- there are issues of water run-off and sight line blocking there is clearly less space for canopy trees.
- This is a grotesque intrusion upon the open and airy vista of contiguous backyards.
- This is an improvement over models A & B but seeing model D this would be a compromise at best.
- This is not a communist country!!
- The step-downs make the house look smaller and also more interesting; more compatible with houses that have grown & changed over 100 + years.
- In all cases, too big; occupies too much of the lot- destroys neighbors privacy in backyard overpowering neighbors
- Same problem. The builder had imposed a structure nor a garden and neighbors lose privacy as builders had windows.
- It doesn't look markedly different from neighboring homes in scale, but it does take up more of the front than would be preferable.
- This model essentially says to neighbors to forget your backyard view - I'm building a wall for you to look at.
- Maintain the historic feel
- Again lot coverage appear to be far more than 33%
- Not Compatible. Too big relative to other houses. Does not fit in.
- Smaller footprint helps. Structural variety.
- Much more appropriate in terms of compatibility & other structures & allows for more space for trees and lawns.
- This is still too large but the staggered size leaves a bit more land
- Better in terms of preserving character.
- Okay

- Keep the Village character.
- Too close to back lot line 33% coverage too much.
- Better than B due to less size & coverage and broken up wall.
- Control of bulk will accomplish this on any lot of any size!
- House is not similar to any of the other seven houses shown
- *Very important - What if every house in Village look like this? Character is destroyed.
- We must plan for change and anticipate what the future could look like. Need FAR standard to conform to Model D, plus height regulation.
- This looks better but again that is irrelevant
- I don't see how the staggered rear addition help much - it's still too big, with too large of an impact on adjacent neighbors.
- Most of the models shown, particularly in A & B, appear to cover more of the lot, to be larger in mass & scale, and to be different in building form than the neighboring houses. However, the concept of “compatibility” implies static. Our neighborhood, which is partly in and partly outside the historic district, looks very different in 2007 than when we moved here in 1981. Given extensive renovation and some new construction, those houses as they exist today would not have been considered “compatible” with the nearby houses in 1981. They are generally larger in mass and scale, often quite different in style (or building form) and cover more of the lot. “Compatibility” with what exists today will inhibit the dynamic evolution in the future that has been a hallmark of CCV for more than 100 years.
- Try 30%
- I don't think it is wise for the Village to try to control these aspects. Too subjective, given Bd members too much control, open Village to litigation we all have to pay for.
- Not Compatible.

Lot Coverage:

Comments for Survey Responses: Compatible

- Still 35% seems high.
- If the house is too big for the lot
- Not too dominant
- Broken up.
- Better setbacks on rear.
- Side yard set back ok, EL is not too big.
- Better solution if owner wants/needs a large home
- Appropriate
- Compatible with A & B
- A larger house than neighbors' is not necessarily incompatible
- But structure begins to look out of character
- Better
- Obvious! A smaller building!

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- See nearby large houses across back lot & 2, 3 doors down.
- Coverage only slightly greater than on other lots
- Lot enough space for trees
- Similar to house at rear on street at back.
- Could benefit by slight reduction-say to 30%.
- Front lot is compatible
- Fits lot better
- Covers too much of the lot with masonry (or wood) building
- Somewhat like facing house
- Better than models a & b
- More varied roof & wall heights
- Rear element is better than "B" but still disrupts back yard continuity.
- Too much coverage.
- improved by smaller one story component
- But how is this only 35% of lot coverage.
- Not as big.
- Better offset in rear

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- Takes up more of lot than neighbors
- Exceeds 35%
- No
- Too much house.
- Too large.
- Too big.
- Excess coverage of back yard area.
- Too large for lot.
- Too big.
- Wasteful at 33%
- Because back structure reduces neighbor's privacy.
- Inconsistent with surrounding properties
- not enough greenspace will encroach on neighbors privacy
- Same as previous. Covers too much of lot.
- house extends FAR beyond neighbors into backyard
- Too much covered
- Looks out of place
- Not in scale

- Too large a footprint
- Too Large
- Blocks neighbor air & light
- Larger building than any of the adjacent homes even the largest area - what happens to setbacks?
- 30% is too much; too massive out of scale
- Coverage much more than other to.
- In all cases, too big; occupies too much of the lot- destroys neighbors privacy in backyard
- Not enough yard left
- Too large, and goes too deep in back.
- Still too big
- Too Big
- Too Big
- Too big based on your pix.
- Not compatible, but so what!!
- Rear view-much too large for lot.
- Too much

Mass & Scale:

Comments for Survey Response: Compatible

- Ugly, but within scale of nearby large houses.
- Not too obvious from street
- Size close to that of either house.
- Although extending farther back, there is space on either side.
- Looks good in front & back.
- Height oks EL almost too big, but just makes it by ok massing could be a bit smaller.
- Does not seem out of place.
- Appropriate
- Compatible with A & B
- a larger house than neighbors' is not necessarily incompatible
- Better
- Obvious! A smaller building!

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- Try to look like its fits in as much as possible.
- a bit large
- Much better than model B
- Needs some height reduction toward the middle.
- Too massive
- Side setback still too close to neighbor

- I still don't like it but its an improvement over the first option (a) because of the graduated sections
- Somewhat like facing house
- Varying wall heights & more centrally located on lot
- Better than models a & b
- More varied roof & wall heights
- It's basically OK. Rear element protrudes a little too far. Step-down element in back is major improvement.
- Too deep
- Not as big

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- Way too large in relation to neighbors
- Exceeds 35 %
- No
- Too large.
- Too large for lot.
- Too big.
- Because height & ways neighboring structures.
- Domineering
- Same as previous examples.
- still too large
- Too large - all views
- Looks out of place
- Too Large
- Too Big
- 30% is too much; too massive out of scale
- From side & rear it looks much larger
- In all cases, too big; occupies too much of the lot- destroys neighbors privacy in backyard
- Too Big. Especially side yard and rear yard perspective.
- Still too big
- Too Big
- Too big based on your pix.
- Not compatible, but so what!!
- Too large and takes too much of property
- Too big (but better than B)

Building Form:

Comments for Survey Response: Compatible

- No Standard.

- Traditional houses with similar styles.
- Resembles forms of other buildings.
- Front and sides do not dwarf neighbors.
- I like the grey down. Nice design.
- Basic concepts OK
- Better than model B
- Appropriate
- Compatible with A & B less pronounced along side yard.
- Front look same others have similar styles

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- Still too massively undifferentiated but much improved.
- Better, less massive.
- Minimize impact on its too neighbors (privacy).
- Same as previous examples.
- A bit less uniform a monster A3.
- Graduated walls setbacks -soften the overall mass of the structure.
- Less intrusive but still too big
- More varied roof & wall heights
- Improved over # 1 & 2 but still large front façade
- Basically OK. Jogs in lines are a big improvement. Two-story element in rear is too large and has not equivalent on the block.
- Problem is size, not shape

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- No step down & too boxlike
- No
- Too large.
- Too big.
- Looks out of place
- Too Large
- 30% is too much; too massive out of scale
- Too much house for adjacent houses
- In all cases, too big; occupies too much of the lot- destroys neighbors privacy in backyard
- Side construction appears to overwhelm neighboring structure
- No L- Shaped House Shown in Area
- Goes too far into backyard.
- Neighbors on side face a wall, house looms over neighbors in back

- Too Big
- Too big
- Too big based on your pix.
- Not compatible, but so what!!
- Still ugly.
- Too large a footprint by house.
- Too massive.

Alternative Infill - Model D [25% Lot Coverage; Floor Area of 4,050 square feet]
Model D: T-shaped 2.5 story infill with rear addition and 1 story side element.

Model D: Overall

- Think this restricts too much on lot coverage & floor area.
- Good God Almighty.
- house still appears too large (as well as driveway) but consider it best compromise of models offered.
- Closer in scale & size. Doesn't loom over neighbor' yards. Clearly the most abstract from outside.
- These are all better than the 35% models -but are not deal These are all better than the 35% models -but are not deal
- These are all better than the 35% models -but are not deal
- Better but still too much! Houses should not be allowed to gain any additional square footage. SUV should be banned as well and lawn chemicals- neither are historic and both are common in McMansion land!
- There should be no imposition of 25% lot coverage if other lots are allowed 35%; and especially not if applied to the relatively smaller lots.
- Eclectic.
- It's no surprise that the less massive house has a third less square footage ~ far less room
- In proportion.
- Only regulate the very very extreme.
- It seems the best solution or comprises for increases habitable floor space, harmonious/balance view and avoiding huge walls/windows over backyard of neighbors.
- This is a little bit better, but still too big and intrusive.
- Too large.
- Better, though still quite massive with the back
- This one is compatible but simply a waste of land.
- Proof that a floor area limit would help.
- Better than previous examples because back extension doesn't abut neighbor's yard, but still breaks visual line of yards.
- Only regulate the very very extreme.
- The next step would be on an influx of large buildings-
- More in keeping with the others.
- Should be left to the experts and the regs be appropriating?? (Undecipherable.)

- Total uniformity is clearly not what the Village needs or wants. Exclude radically jarring contrasts, but provide for pleasing, interesting, and imaginative differences in all 3 categories.
- Although still too tall, the infill is more compatible w/existing homes.
- This is much better.
- Much less destructive of surrounding character.
- Better than A, B or C.
- I like this the best! However, the FAR might not meet needs of potential buyers and probably would limit builder's profits. Is this the scenario where variations in regulations for different
- Village sections would work.
- Too massive.
- Looks nice, but may be unrealistic in terms of getting neighborhood approval--how about a 30% lot coverage compromise?
- This is fine, but not as a limit.
- Both in style & size it fits I well with the other houses.
- Better setbacks on rear, Looks good in front & back, I like the grey down. Nice design.
- Perfect for Village atmosphere.
- Respects the character of existing homes.
- Side yard not as important...might allow 2 stories and a greater sf.
- Should require variance by Board of Managers
- One good feature of the Village is the variety of architectural styles, ages and sizes (depending on lot size) of its homes
- I oppose reducing current regulated allowed size limits. Reduce housing values.
- This is only slightly larger than the adjoining houses. Seems reasonable.
- This works!!
- Much about size. The existing size, current regs are ok to me, it's the design review that need attention.
- Regs. alternatives seemed geared towards setting a maximum of 25% lot coverage, but this would be an arbitrary cap that would be too restrictive in a variety of context.
- This is not yet a total disaster, & we could live with this.
- Depends upon the wishes of the owner architect
- Not out proportion with neighboring houses
- The least intrusive
- Better example, using 1 story & in rear only.
- Still too much mass would like to see garage set back
- 30% is too much; too massive out of scale
- Still too much mass would like to see garage set back
- This is a grotesque intrusion upon the open and airy vista of contiguous backyards.
- Hope it's an owner & not a developer.
- This looks much better.
- This probably is best visually, but could be too restrictive with one-story element.
- better design = but still too long in rear.
- Side element too massive
- Same issue. Same problem

- There are enough breaks in the buildings design to make it comparable. However it looks as if a number of the other homes also take up a lot of the lot. Therefore, equally over-large for their lots!!
- This is more compatible but it shows why 25% is not a magic. 25% still may cause problems of compatibility & serving a green lot to 25% lot coverage will, overtime, result in a huge change to the Village for the worse.
- Best alternative, least jarring or out of place.
- Maintain the historic feel
- This looks like 35% lot coverage, or even a bit more. I think the aerial perspective drawings are all mistakenly making responsible accurately difficult.
- Additions to existing large scaled Village homes that are not in scale or proportion will look odd and this is too restrictive to personal preference of owner's property.
- Jump in size not as drastic as models A, B, and C.
- Small footprint makes it easy to fit structure into environment. Problem is that many may want larger house. But the era of the large house will soon end.
- Much more pleasing but substantially less than current regulations so probably not practical
- This one seems to have less sq footage off the yard. The 1 story side seems to reduce the effect of the size on the existing of houses and it appears not to be taller than the neighbors.
- This is basically the result that we need to prescribe by regulation. People are going to build larger houses, so we need to accept some visual impact. But if needs to be controlled.
- Looks more like neighbors--maintains architectural character.
- Okay
- 25% coverage about right-more representative-but too far into back yard.
- This works because it fits and implements many of the features discussed above--if people want another few thousand square feet, let them do so BELOW grade.
- Control of bulk will accomplish this on any lot of any size!
- This is an acceptable alternative. But I do not like the T-shape. House stick out too far in rear yard perspective. Side yard and street front are okay.
- Restriction of lot coverage - done through FAR or other mechanism - will maintain Village character and property values.
- Need other tools, as discussed earlier. Cannot tell how tall this example is.
- It's compatible but concerned we will be over regulating lot coverage & our property values will suffer.
- Restriction seems excessive and would have negative impact on property values.
- Perhaps is more palatable to the neighbor on the one-story side, but the footprint seems too large.
- This looks better but again that is irrelevant
- Just too big and out-of-sync with established building patterns
- Most of the models shown, particularly in A & B, appear to cover more of the lot, to be larger in mass & scale, and to be different in building form than the neighboring houses. However, the concept of "compatibility" implies static. Our neighborhood, which is partly in and partly outside the historic district, looks very different in 2007 than when we moved here in 1981. Given extensive renovation and some new construction, those houses as they exist today would not have been considered "compatible" with the nearby

houses in 1981. They are generally larger in mass and scale, often quite different in style (or building form) and cover more of the lot. "Compatibility" with what exists today will inhibit the dynamic evolution in the future that has been a hallmark of CCV for more than 100 years.

- How true are these pix in the overall Village?
- I don't think it is wise for the Village to try to control these aspects. Too subjective, given Bd members too much control, open Village to litigation we all have to pay for add'l don't want to see Village increase staff numbers.
- These views give all the houses breathing room. 25% coverage is the key! (plus reasonable setbacks)

Lot Coverage:

Comments for Survey Response: Compatible

- "Main" part has smaller scale. Other points have "added on" quality of neighborhood.
- see nearby large houses ~ across back lot & 2,3 doors down
- fits with defined lot
- Very comparable to largest neighbor. Just a bit bigger.
- Front and back yards compatible is adjacent houses.
- Best yet- Better than "C"
- Not out of place
- Appropriate
- The least overbearing form
- Visually less massive
- Much more in character with surroundings
- Conforms to size of other houses
- More Appropriate
- Front façade is similar to neighbors
- Wall & roof heights varied, mass of infill smaller
- Better
- Leaves enough backyard continuity.
- Too large because of location of T-structure.
- Obvious! A smaller building!
- Not so overwhelming to other houses
- Coverage closer to others

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- May exceed 35%.
- Better sized.
- New result is too large in proportion to other buildings.
- New result is too large in proportion to other buildings.
- Coverage not greatly larger than on other lots

- Doesn't seem to cover as much of the lot.
- Better but I still worry addition will dominate neighbors backyard
- Too much covered
- Smaller footprint better
- better relation to size/scaled of neighboring properties although still larger.
- Goes back a lot further, the house opposite does somewhat
- This continues to have a huge adverse impact on odd adjacent properties
- Does not overwhelm the street

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- Too big.
- Looks out of place
- Too Large
- The rear section projects into the backyard too much. Out of line with the everyone else in form of setback.
- Goes too far back
- Too restrictive for expansion & comparable architecture
- Too big
- Too Big

Mass & Scale:

Comments for Survey Response: Compatible

- The best of the choices in the exercise.
- More harmonious
- Size appears to match that of other house.
- Ditto- A bit bigger all around, but not dramatically so.
- Same as adjacent house
- The mass is disguised by clever placement of rooms.
- Good Design
- Appropriate
- Variation in levels
- Respect the existing lots
- Not overwhelming
- Conforms to size of other houses
- More Appropriate
- roof height and 1 story side room compatible with neighbor's houses.
- Wall & roof heights varied, mass of infill smaller
- Better
- "T" is better than "L" less impact on neighbors.
- Obvious! A smaller building!
- Too large.

- M & S greater but not highly out of line.

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- Larger than neighbors, but not as off scale as previous models.
- Better sized.
- Better design
- Shorter side building helps soften profile
- Too tall
- Side yards very small
- FAR approach helps
- much more in with in other structures in the neighborhood (block)
- Centrally located, 1 story structure on side is improvement
- Is bigger but not as much
- This continues to have a huge adverse impact on odd available properties
- Rear structure people is too high/wide
- Side elements helps
- Still large from rear yard - needs change
- Better mix with neighboring houses

Comments for Survey Responses: Not Compatible

- Too big.
- Looks out of place
- Too Large
- Too big
- Architecture look odd as a result
- Too big
- Too Big

Building Form:

Comments for Survey Response: Compatible

- Most varied of form create lower mass
- Less concern from backyard
- Form differs in some ways but is not incompatible.
- Similar to neighboring buildings.
- Good Design
- Appropriate
- much more in with in other structures in the neighborhood (block)
- Variation in levels
- Doesn't overwhelm the neighboring homes.

- Seems harmonious
- Conforms to size of other houses
- has similar shapes
- More Appropriate
- Only difference is it is deeper house which I do not think objectionable.
- Wall & roof heights varied, mass of infill smaller
- Best side yard perspective
- Better
- One-story elements are key. Would prefer if gable of side element matched neighbors.
- One-story side construction & rear center softens affect on other buildings
- Architecturally it has been made to fit into neighborhood.
- Too large.
- Close enough

Comments for Survey Response: Somewhat Compatible

- Seems generally consistent
- Looks appropriate.
- side element helps structure seems more in line with neighbors.
- Side shed is a bit weird but relates to neighbor's screen or enclosed porch.
- Similar to adjacent houses
- not rectangular
- Don't like T-Shape no other similar shapes on blocks
- Other homes show similar variation

Comments for Survey Response: Not Compatible

- Too big.
- Looks out of place
- Too Large
- Odd shaped improvements
- The form fits with the other homes.
- Too Big
- Too Big
- Still seems ugly